DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 870 CE 046 120

AUTHOR Rosenbaum, Allan; Zirkin, Barbara G.
TITLE The Maryland State Job Service: Transition and Renewal. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., Catonsville. Maryland Inst. for Policy Analysis and Research.
SPONS AGENCY Governor's Employment and Training Council, Annapolis, MD.; Maryland State Dept. of Employment and Training, Baltimore.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 164p.
AVAILABLE FROM MIPAR, Thomas M. Bradley Center, University of Maryland Baltimore County, Catonsville, MD 21228 ($7.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Role; Change Strategies; *Employee Attitudes; *Employer Attitudes; Employment Level; Employment Patterns; *Employment Services; *Job Placement; *Program Effectiveness; Program Improvement; *State Programs; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Maryland

ABSTRACT

A study evaluated the various aspects of the Maryland Job Service, including the services it provides, coordination between the service and related agencies, the degree to which services provided are congruent with and driven by federal mandates, and employers' and applicants' perceptions of the service. Job services available in other states were identified, and related service delivery and policy options for the Maryland program were considered. Program sites throughout the state were observed, and a survey of 500 employers throughout the state was conducted. Of the 186 employers who responded to the survey, 35.5 percent reported using the Job Service during the past two years. Over half the jobs listed with the service paid between $3.50 and $5.50 per hour, confirming the notion that most employers use the Job Service for lower-level jobs. Sixty-three percent of those using the service considered it helpful. Of the 100 Job Service applicants interviewed, at least 75 percent had not been fully informed about all the services available through the service. Of the 45 individuals who were employed at the time of the interview, only 8 had located their present job through the Job Service. It was recommended that the Job Service be separated from Unemployment Insurance operations, that its large centralized offices be broken up, and that a planning system be developed that orignates at the level of the individual offices. (Appendixes to this report include a discussion of the use of private employment agencies by AFDC/WIN programs, sample employer and client questionnaires, and supplemental data tables.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277870

THE MARYLAND STATE JOB SERVICE:

TRANSITION AND RENEWAL

FINAL REPORT

1985

Prepared for the
Maryland Department of Employment and Training
and the
Job Service Committee
of the
Governor's Employment and Training Council

Researched and Prepared by:

Allan Rosenbaum, Director
Maryland Institute for Policy Analysis and Research
University of Maryland Baltimore County

Barbara G. Zirkin, Senior Project Manager
Maryland Institute for Policy Analysis and Reseearch
University of Maryland Baltimore County

Assisted by:
Courtney Petersen
Shelagh McTeague
Glenn Farber
Joanne Radice
Jan Sopher
Nina von Gunten

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A Rosenbaum

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE046120

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Introduction		1
Part I:	Review and Assessment of Job Service Activities	11
Part II:	Review and Assessment of Coordination Activities	38
Part III:	Influence of Federal Legal Framework on Job Service Operations	49
Part IV:	Employer Perceptions of the Maryland State Employment Service	59
	Table 1 - Response Frequency Distribution of Employer Perspective of the Job Service	71
Part V:	Applicant Perceptions of the Maryland State Employment Service	76
	Table 2 - Frequency Distribution of Employment Service Client Questionnaire Response	81
Part VI:	Job Service Salaries	90
	Table 3 - Selected Base Salaries of Selected Employment Positions and Comparable Representative Jobs	97
Part VII:	Employment Service Activities in Other Selected Localities	99
Part VIII:	Organizational and Policy Recommendations for the Maryland State Employment Service	111

Appendix A: Use of Private Employment Agencies by AFDC/WIN Programs
Appendix B: Sample of Employer Questionnaire
Appendix C: Sample of Client Questionnaire
Appendix D: Supplemental Data Tables

Introduction

The report that follows was initiated and commissioned by the Secretary of the Maryland Department of Employment and Training, Dr. Brent Johnson, and the Job Service Committee, chaired by Mr. Leslie Meil, of the Maryland Governor's Employment and Training Council. It has been financed by a grant from the Maryland Department of Employment and Training (DET) to the Maryland Institute for Policy Analysis and Research (MIPAR) at the University of Maryland Baltimore County. Its purpose is to serve as a beginning point as well as a blueprint for organization self-renewal.

On the face of it, one might wonder why the DET, in only its second year of operation, should be concerned at its youthful age with organizational self-renewal. In fact, however, like many newly organized agencies, the Maryland DET was only partially new, having been created through the combining of several pre-existing, formerly separate organizations. Among the most venerable parts of the new Department was the approximately 315 person Maryland State Employment Service (Job Service), which is the focus of this report.

Having originated in the 1930's, the State Employment Service is designed to serve as a critical link between Maryland's employment seeking citizens and its employer community. While it is a very substantial organization in itself, with a fiscal 1984 budget of $11,000,000, for much of

its recent history it has been an organization which has stood in the shadows of other organizations. Until two years ago, and the creation of the Maryland DET, the Employment Service, as well as most of the state's employment and training activities, was located within the Maryland Department of Human Resources (DHR), where their activities represented only a very small, and often ignored, portion of the budget and the personnel of that large state agency.

Removal of the Employment Service from the DHR and its integration into the new DET served only partially to move it out from under the shadows of a dominating and inhibiting organizational superstructure. Even within the organizational framework of the new DET, the Employment Service has remained as the often overlooked junior partner in a partially intertwined, partially independent, dual organizational structure with the state's unemployment insurance system. While there appears to have been some benefits to these organizational arrangements, there have been many unfortunate, unintended consequences. Among these have been a seeming blurring of the mission and purposes of the Employment Service, an inability to obtain needed resources and to use extant ones most effectively. Perhaps the most harmful consequence of these circumstances, however, has been the fact that the Employment Service has been so overshadowed organizationally that it has often been overlooked by the top leadership of the agencies of which over the years it has

been a part. The result is an organization that has suffered both internally and externally in its public image due to a lack of leadership interest in it and its activities.

The unfortunate consequences of that absence of interest and the years of neglect will be readily evident to the reader of this report. The portrait that is painted here is one of a state Job Service that is in need of increased attention and improved management as well as significant program revitalization. None of this will come as a surprise to the staff of the Employment Service. Indeed, it is they who have provided the majority of the information that is to be found in this report and have identified, for the research team, the most serious of the problems that must be addressed.

Having indicated that there is much to be done, it is very important to keep in mind that a great deal has been accomplished in the past two years. Significant steps have been taken to introduce new automated data processing capabilities into the everyday operations of the Job Service. While salaries continue to lag behind those of comparable organizations, DET's top leadership worked hard to bring about a substantial salary increase for all employees during this past year. At the direction of the Secretary of DET, a "Job Service Revitalization Plan" has been developed. Early drafts of this report on the Job Service were made

available to DET staff for their review in the development of the Revitalization Plan.

New staff training programs and the initiation of a computerized job and skill matching system are among other notable and needed recent initiatives. Indeed, when fully implemented, these efforts should put the Maryland Job Service well ahead of most other states in these areas of activity. Finally, this report on the organization and activities of the Maryland Employment Service represents yet another step by the Department's leadership to explore ways to build a better Job Service. Throughout this process, the Job Service Committee of the Governor's Employment and Training Council has been a source of ideas and suggestions as well as an encouraging advocate of the Department's efforts.

The timing of this report, and these renewal efforts in general, are particularly fortuitous. It was 51 years ago that the Congress approved the Wagner-Peyser Act, thus creating the Federally funded, state administered public Employment Service. The purpose of the public Employment Service, then, as now, was to assist the nations's unemployed in finding employment, preferably in the private sector. Two years after it enacted Wagner-Peyser, the Congress approved the Social Security Act of 1935. This landmark legislation both set up the nation's unemployment insurance system (UI) and mandated that all UI recipients must register

for and seek employment through the Employment Service. In the period from 1935 to 1980, the Federally mandated functions of the Employment Service continued to expand and now, not only are several specialized programs administered by the Employment Service, but many participants in other Federal programs must register with their local Employment Service offices. Thus, the roles and the activities of the Employment Service have grown substantially over time.

As the functions of the U.S. Employment Service have expanded, the organizational, administrative, and economic environment in which it operates has also changed. The decline of the traditional smoke-stack industries, the growth of both new high technology and established service occupations, and the emergence in this country over the past several decades of a growing body of hard-core disadvantaged citizens who have great difficulty in competing in the private economy have all affected the Employment Service and its operations. Moreover, during the past three years, the organization of the U.S. Employment Service, as it is structured by Federal legislation and policy, has changed significantly.

Not only has the Wagner-Peyser Act been amended by the Congress, but in addition, the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), which Congress enacted in 1981, includes a number of provisions that affect the operation of the U.S. Employment Service. Furthermore, in keeping with the general goal of

the Reagan Administration to lessen Federal involvement in state and local government's activities, Federal oversight of and technical assistance to the state agencies administering Employment Service programs has decreased significantly. One prominent manifestation of this is seen in the fact that the number of Federal employees responsible for administering the Employment Service at the Washington office of the Department of Labor has declined from about 300 to 50.

Within the State of Maryland, the environment in which the Employment Service functions has been no less in flux than has been the case nationally. The impact of both declining traditional heavy industry and rapidly expanding high technology has been felt dramatically within the State. Unemployment figures have risen and fallen with remarkable speed, and yet they still remain significant. Adding to this state of flux, the Maryland General Assembly, at its 1983 session, established the Maryland Jobs Training Partnership Act and the Governor's Employment and Training Council and created the Maryland Department of Employment and Training.

It was within this broader context that, during the summer of 1984, the Maryland Department of Employment and Training and the Governor's Employment and Training Council (GETC) of the State of Maryland entered into a contract with the Maryland Institute for Policy Analysis and Research at the University of Maryland Baltimore County to undertake a study of the organization and operations of the Maryland

State Job Service. As it was initially designed, this study involved carrying out the following tasks:

Task I. Describing and assessing the services provided by the Job Service.

Task II. Describing and assessing the degree of coordination that exists between the Job Service and other related agencies and organizations.

Task III. Assessing the degree to which current Job Service activities are congruent with and driven by Federal mandates.

Task IV. Assessing employers' perceptions of the activities of the Job Service.

Task V. Obtaining a better understanding of what other states are doing with their state Job Service.

Task VI. Assessing service delivery and policy options for the Maryland Job Service.

What follows is the final report of this study of the State Job Service by the Maryland Institute for Policy Analysis and Research. As the reader will observe, the material presented in Part I includes an extended discussion of our findings with regard to Task I. This section is based upon observations made during the course of site visits of two to four days in duration conducted by one or more project staff members at six Employment Service offices located around the State of Maryland. Briefer visits have been made to several other offices. Task II, describing and assessing coordination between the Employment Service and other related agencies is dealt with in Part II. It is based both on observations and interviews carried out at Job

Service offices and nine of the State's ten JTPA Service Delivery Area agencies. Task III, examining Federal mandates, is briefly dealt with at different points in the material in Part I which describes our assessment of the services currently being provided by the Job Service. We also deal with this in more depth in Part III of this report.

Task IV was expanded from a survey of a sample of 100 to a sample of 500 employers. The results were based on responses received and are reported in Part IV. The reader will find in Part V a report on the data collected in the course of a survey of job seeking clients' attitudes and observations regarding the functioning of the Employment Service. Part VI of this report focuses on a particular area of concern to both the leadership of DET and this research team - the adequacy of the Job Service Salary structure. Task V, an assessment of the way in which the Employment Service functions in other selected places, is dealt with in Part VII. Task VI, the laying out of organization and policy options for the Maryland State Employment Service, is found in Part VIII of this report.

The staff of the Maryland Institute for Policy Analysis and Research has been greatly assisted by several individuals in the conduct of the research that is being presented in this report. Brent Johnson, DET's Secretary, and Leslie Meil and the members of the GETC Job Service Committee have been totally supportive and have provided many valuable insights.

James Callahan, the DET's Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training has been the model of what an effective project officer should be - encouraging, a source of excellent ideas and totally unobtrusive in the conduct of the research. George Merrill, who throughout the duration of this project served as the Executive Director of the Governor's Employment and Training Council, demonstrated a real commitment helping to make this effort possible and through his skillful leadership has made it feasible for the research team to avoid more than a few pitfalls. Stuart Douglas, the Director of the State Employment Service, has shown both leadership as well as commitment to the organization he heads. Aware as he was that a study of this sort would inevitably focus more on the problem areas than successes, he could have impeded it; instead, he facilitated it with his support and encouragement. On a number of occasions, Gary Moore, of the GETC staff, has provided the research staff with delightfully good humored assistance.

Most of all, the research team is indebted to the staff of the Employment Service. They are a dedicated and hard-working group of individuals. They are very aware of their organizational strengths as well as of the problems that have been created as a consequence of more than a few years of organizational neglect, benign and otherwise. If this report serves as a vehicle to call official attention to the long frustration and the plight of the organization within which

they struggle to work effectively, then it will have achieved its purpose.

Part I

Review and

Assessment of Job Service Activities

The primary purpose of the Maryland State Employment Service (Job Service) is to provide employment placement activities for both individual clients who have registered with the Job Service and those employers who have listed job vacancies with the Service. The Job Service is administered by the Maryland Department of Employment and Training through a system of 27 local offices located in cities and towns throughout the State. These local offices are organized into five separate regional divisions. Each region is headed by a regional administrator whose responsibilities include the facilitation of communication between the Department's central office staff, and the managers at each local office.

Job Service performance is measured at the local level through an accounting of new applications for employment and renewals, job openings received from employers and the placement of clients in jobs or training. Local Employment Service offices provide the following services to job applicants: referral to jobs, employment counseling, testing, referral to various support services including training, eligibility review for Targeted Job Tax Credit (TJTC), special services to veterans and other special populations, inter- and intrastate clearance, job search workshop sessions, and other activities. For employers

utilizing the Job Service, local offices provide the following services: receipt and posting of job openings (job orders), provision of special testing when and where requested by employers (such as for clerical skills or motor coordination), conducting on-site placement activities for employers, encouragement of employment use and input via the local Job Service Employer Committee, and coordinating certain other related activities as requested by given employers.

Physical Facilities and Environment

The Job Service in Maryland, as in other states, is all too frequently perceived as an agency of last resort by both employers and job seekers. One significant reason for that is to be found in the physical appearance of many of its facilities. During the past two years increased attention has been paid to the physical appearance of the offices. Nevertheless, some offices, especially those in the larger metropolitan areas, range in appearance from unattractive to dismally depressing. Equally disturbing is the sheer size of some of the Job Service offices. In major metropolitan areas, these offices are quite large and made to appear even more so because they are, as is the case throughout the state, co-located with the Unemployment Insurance offices. The result is the image of large, impersonal waiting rooms, long lines, even longer waits for service, and, whether accurate or not, a cold and unresponsive bureaucracy.

No one is more aware of this, sensitive to it, or more profoundly affected by it than the staff and the clients of the Employment Service. The location and physical appearance of Job Service facilities are frequently mentioned concerns of the managers and staff of these offices. Local office location sites vary from isolated buildings locaed on the fringe of a downtown area to modern facilities that in some cases are co-located with other government offices or found near or within a shopping center. Offices located in more modern buildings tend to have a more streamlined and newer appearance. In those cases, the furniture mostly matches, the cubicles or walls are mostly neat and uniform, the carpet on the floor and the walls are reasonably clean, and the lighted space provides a desired open look. In contrast, the clutter of some job services offices, particularly those in large population areas, combined with the hodge-podge of furniture and makeshift walls and cubicles, suggests an atmosphere of gloom and lack of organization that is counter-productive to effective functioning - both for applicants and employers, as well as for the employees of these offices themselves. At least one office manager commented to an interviewer that they did not wish to bring employers into the office because of its obvious lack of professional atmosphere.

Not all Job Service offices have adequate facilities to provide separate rooms where job search workshops, Job

Service testing of applicants, and office-site recruitment can occur. Additionally, there is a significant need for more space in some offices to maintain job information microfiche readers or job information boards. It is not obvious in some of the more cramped and jumbled offices that these important facilities exist and are available and, in fact, they may not be. The appearance of Job Service offices is obviously an important consideration in the upgrading of the image of the Job Service. If it is to be perceived as an agency equipped to handle professionally run labor market exchange activities and not just as an afterthought, ad-hoc extension of the Unemployment Insurance Office (with which, in all but one instance, the Job Service is co-located), then significant upgrading and changing of facilities, particularly in the more populous areas of the state, will be required.

Office Organization and Staffing

Each office maintains an organizational chart detailing the primary duties of its staff. The size of the staff, and as a consequence the complexity of the organization, varies dramatically from community to community, with, in general, larger offices being located in more densely populated areas. Most offices contain one or more persons in an applicant services unit and one or more persons in an employer services unit. Additionally, at least one staff person is designated as either the Local Veterans Employee Representative (LVER) or Disabled Veterans Outreach Represen-

tative (DVOPS) and is responsible only for the veteran population that registers with the Job Service. Organizational variation among the offices surveyed is attributable to the management style of the office manager, the size and workload of the offices, the designated categories of workers, and the staff vacancies (which in some instances were significant) within each office.

In almost all offices surveyed, most staff have a variety of duties to perform, even though each person may have primary responsibility for one specific task. For example, an applicant interviewer may also have responsibility for doing clerical data entry of information, rectifying of data printouts returned from central office, answering the phone and taking job orders from employers, assisting with eligibility determinations for Targeted Jobs Tax Credit (TJTC), and providing counseling assistance. One office surveyed was primarily organized according to tasks performed rather than by area of responsibility. This same office, however, was overburdened with ES trainees and has few higher rated interviewers. Another office, in contrast, has clearly delineated applicant service, employer service, and counseling units. The employees are responsible for spending the majority of their time in primary tasks and only do other tasks when and if there is time. Yet a third office visited was large enough to need three persons at the supervisory level, each one with primary, but not exclusive, responsi-

bility for job order searches within specified DOT codes. Clearly, there is much variation in the organization of local Job Service offices. While this is quite necessary under the circumstances, it does contribute to the difficulty which senior management has traditionally had in ensuring an adequate and uniform quality of services.

One organizational problem upon which all offices agree is that the very extensive record keeping tasks have produced a need for increased levels of clerical and similar support staff. The data entry tasks are continuous and at times overwhelming. In at least one office, an interviewer functions in a secretarial capacity and in another there is no secretary for even the office manager. In yet another office, an office supervisor spends several hours a week keeping current the justification of computer-generated information with office records and correcting clerical errors. In several instances it appeared that the combination of major data collection and record keeping requirements and a lack of clerical staff significantly affected the overall organizational and work pattern of the offices.

Each of the offices is headed by a manager who oversees both Employment Service and UI activities. Several of the larger offices also have a supervisor for unemployment insurance personnel and one for job service personnel. Smaller offices may have "lead workers" who function in a similar capacity to the supervisory personnel in the larger

offices. In the mid-size offices, the lead worker would be in charge of a particular unit such as the employer services unit or the applicant services unit. In some offices, the lead worker would be responsible for the supervision of several other persons, but they may not be designated as responsible for a single unit within the office. In addition, each of the offices may have personnel designated as ES-Is through ES-IVs, ES trainees, counselors (ranked I or II), Veterans representatives, and Employer Service Representatives (ESRs). The staffing patterns vary considerably from office to office. Some offices have no counselor, designated or not. Some are lacking a designated ESR. These gaps in staffing are seen by the staff themselves as detrimental to the effective functioning of the Job Service and produce frustration among current staff since each office is held accountable for providing these services.

Many of the staff in the local offices have been with the Job Service for a long time. In each office surveyed, the manager was a long-time employee of DET, although not all had been exclusively with the Job Service. Many staff members had come up the ladder through other agencies within the Maryland State Government system, or other units with DET. Thus, some were more aware of and dedicated to Job Service activities than others. Managerial style appeared to be an important component to the successful functioning of the offices. Where the management style seemed more profes-

sional, the office appeared to function more efficiently. The presence of a more casual management style appeared to lead some employees to complain about the lack of direction and firmness of purpose within the office.

Organizational performance and staffing is also affected by the necessity to fulfill obligations that are not routine Job Service functions. For example, at certain times of the year there is a need for additional staff to accommodate the demands of agricultural employers and employees. This need arises due to the Federal government regulations regarding hiring practices related to this special population. At one affected office several, albeit temporary, staff had been hired in order to handle increased workload in this area, causing resentment on the part of staff that felt routinely overloaded. Another example of such staffing strain can be seen in the push to implement the Emergency Veterans Job Training Act (EVJTA). In several offices, veterans' personnel were pulled out of local offices in order to facilitate the central office operations directing the effort to comply with the EVJTA. Such staffing changes, often required on short notice, would, in some cases, have little impact. In this situation it can have the impact of making demoralized staff even more so. Additionally, in the past, staff has often been pulled from office duties for training or other administrative concerns, and there has been no mechanism to

provide a replacement person so that steady work could continue.

Four further observations related to the staffing of offices need to be noted. Both managerial and employee staff have voiced frustration and dismay over what they view as the lack of mobility within the career structure of the Job Service. They see little room for advancement, and what there is appears to them to take an inordinate amount of time to achieve. Second, there is an evident lack of adequate opportunity for professional training to facilitate not only career movement, but the adequate performance of routine responsibilities. Third, people are sometimes performing staff functions without the appropriate title or recompense. Fourth, managers report frustration with their inability to do their own hiring and firing. They feel this process is out of their hands and weakens their control over their staff.

Job Service Operations

New Applications and Renewals

The job applications process is handled by the ES interviewers. Veterans are handled by specially designated staff persons, who are themselves veterans. There are no special qualifications to become an interviewer, and thus anyone who can fulfill minimum employment eligibility requirements can become an interviewer. Obviously, some become better at the process than others. When applicants

come to the Job Service office, they can be seen by anyone who is free. Currently, no offices are run by appointment. Many persons were observed performing the interviewing process and very great variation in interest, capability, and approach among them was noted by the research staff.

After registering with a central desk, an applicant will wait for varying periods of time, sometimes a half hour or more, depending on the degree to which the staff is occupied. The applicant fills out a form detailing certain catalog information about his/her previous job experiences. When called (and in some offices this is by number rather than name, adding to the coldness), the applicant then meets with an individual interviewer. At this point, the interviewer assesses the employment area (DOT code) in which the applicant should be placed in terms of their previous job experience and/or expressed wishes. Ironically, those who have recently received training in a new skill or job area may not be assigned DOT codes for the new area because such codes may not yet exist. One other significant problem is that there is no way for the job service interviewer actually to verify the accuracy of the information given to them by the candidate for employment, in part because the interviewer cannot check references. These circumstances frequently result in much frustration for both client and potential employer.

Once the interview process is completed, the interviewer may make several determinations. The applicant can be listed for employment, can be referred to training programs through the JTPA, or referred for some testing or vocational counseling to determine job readiness. Another additional service that an interviewer might offer an applicant is participation in a job search workshop. Applicants may not be compelled, however, to use any of these services.

An interviewer may do a preliminary search for suitable jobs for the applicant while they are at the desk or may just take the information necessary to record a registration and place the individual into the active file for future job considerations. Which activity takes place often appears to depend solely upon the energy level of the interviewer and the assertiveness and/or job-ready skills of the applicant. The applicant can be encouraged to avail themselves of the opportunity to use the microfiche readers to look for possible appropriate jobs. Most applicants never do.

To be an effective interviewer requires the ability to sort out accurately the abilities of the individual applicant. Each case may be different. There is a definite lack of coordinated training for individuals who become interviewers, a lack they themselves are very aware of and cite freely. Moreover, the current system does not encourage the interviewer really to focus on the individual and his or her employment needs.

New applications and renewals is one of the three key categories of reporting information that are used for appraisal of the performance of the local Job Service offices. Consequently, interviewers have a major responsibility for record keeping. This produces many problems. Great amounts of staff time is consumed by these tasks. Inter- and intraoffice animosity is created as rumors are passed that some offices have been unwilling to report new applications and/or renewals unless it is shown to result in a placement.

Employer Services

Employer services involve two basic activities: the taking and filling out of job orders telephoned into the Job Service offices and employer service representative outreach. Each activity is expected to lead to the learning about and filling of vacant positions with qualified applicants. In this sense, the employer is certainly the key to the placement activities of the Job Service offices. Without adequate levels of employer use of the Job Service through the listing of vacant positions, it is difficult to imagine that successful functioning can occur.

The basic process is relatively simple. An employer wishing to utilize the Job Service merely places a call to any office. An employer is not restricted to any one Job Service office or any one locality. The employer gives the vacancy announcement to either the person who has answered

the telephone, which can be any interviewer at the Job Service office, or may list the job with that person who is designated as the employer service representative or the Job Service office "account executive." The advantage of the latter approach is that it is useful to have the person taking the job order as familiar as possible with the employer in order to expedite the process. The order taker completes a job order form, listing the DOT code most appropriate for the job listing, the necessary qualifications for the job and the salary for the position.

Depending upon the office, the lead worker then does one of several things with the job order. It can be posted on a listing board so that a potential applicant can view a job listing and then ask an interviewer about the position. In some offices, publicizing the job order is delayed from 24 to 48 hours in order to give preference to veterans. As a consequence, veterans possibly will have their names given to employers before the job is released to most interviewers. In several offices there was a widely held belief, with some basis in fact, that some veterans' personnel held back on releasing the most readily fillable jobs in order that they might subsequently fill those jobs and obtain credit for the placement of a person in that job. Veterans' personnel feel that same way about regular office personnel. In contrast, inappropriate and not-readily-fillable jobs will be released quickly to other staff and clients. This situation has, at

times, caused much resentment among office staff because of real or imagined pressures which they feel regarding the need to meet various placement goals even though office personnel appear to be working towards a similar goal; there is a definite lack of interest.

Once a job order is released, the applicant files are then searched in an attempt to find a group of appropriately qualified applicants for the employer to interview. As presently carried out, this is a time-consuming and extremely tedious task. It requires several events to have accurately taken place: both the applicant and job order DOT codes had to have been correctly chosen, both applicant information and job order information had to have been correctly entered into the files, and, finally, that the interviewer has had time to do an accurate search. The introduction of the data-based job search capability now being developed and tested at two local offices will definitely simplify and improve this process. In addition, however, increased clerical backup will probably be necessary to insure that the information from both employers and applicants has been entered quickly. Moreover, the accuracy of DOT coding is essential to this process and requires that the interviewers and job order takers be thoroughly trained in doing this task.

When a list of potential employees has been completed, it is the job of an interviewer to contact either the

employer or applicants, to supply them with the pertinent information and to make arrangements for interviews. Should any of the potential applicants be hired, it becomes the responsibility of the employer to notify the Job Service office that a hire has occurred for placement record purposes. The process can and does break down when neither the employer nor the applicant notify the Job Service office that a hire has been made and it is necessary to remove the job and the client from the files. The employer contact person thus has to contact listing employers on a regular basis to determine whether a hire has taken place, another clerical task that demands time from professional employees.

The second function of employer service personnel is the employer outreach activities. Only designated ESR persons are allowed to perform job development activities, although many interviewers also informally perform this function, especially for professional, veteran, or domestic job applicants. This particular part of the job requires that ESR persons go out to employers, literally selling Job Service activities to new employers in the area and reminding old employers that Job Service activities are available, free, to them. This activity is felt to be essential in maintaining Job Service viability within the community. The ESR emphasizes that the Job Service is capable of offering employers a referral system, the testing of applicants when requested, and a pool of qualified applicants without the

employer having to do the necessary time-consuming tasks of screening applications. Almost unanimously, ESRs report that there is a need to do both more and better promotion of the services of the Job Service to the State's employers. They also view the job development activities of other agencies, such as the SDA's, as competing with them in the same basic market. Another frequently expressed concern is that employer use of the Job Service is most often relegated to the listing of minimum wage, entry-level positions. It is widely felt by Job Service staff that this use of their service activities has created an image of the Employment Service that is detrimental to its successful functioning and does not reflect an accurate picture of its activities.

A third service activity in which employers are involved is the Job Service Employers Committee (JSEC). This committee is composed of all interested employers in an area who are interested in Job Service activities and are helping to promote it to other employers. The ESR is the Job Service liaison to this committee. In some areas, the committee meets regularly to discuss Job Service operations, to offer assistance and suggestions to the Job Service office and to provide a forum for a discussion of labor market information that is useful to the employer. In some offices the JSEC is not very active. In other localities, the JSEC is highly involved in the operations of the local office. This can be helpful or detrimental depending upon the strength of the

office manager in maintaining control of Job Service operations. Without doubt, however, this group can be, and is, of valuable assistance to the image and functioning of the Job Service.

Data Reporting Activities

A 1983 report by the United States General Accounting Office (GAO), "Problems Affecting the Accuracy and Timeliness of Employment Service Reporting Systems," looked at a representative sample of the 50 states, excluding Maryland, and found great problems in Employment Service reporting systems. Among these were: delay of information transmission; lack of computer capability; need to maintain bulky and duplicative paper records; delays in error correction; inaccurate or discrepant figures reported for various activities; and a general need to reformulate reported information to make it effective for other uses. Two years ago these problems were of severe proportion in Maryland. Today, despite the fact that there are still problems associated with the gathering, reporting and analyzing of data, Maryland has made very important gains in eliminating or reducing the kind of problems that were noted in the GAO report.

The Maryland Job Service, like other comparable organizations, has massive data collection, data entry and data analysis tasks which it must regularly perform if it is to serve effectively both those seeking employment and the

State's employers. As a consequence, the data entry process is one that requires much attention, especially to maintain accurate and current listings of both applicants and available jobs. The Job Service has made very significant progress over the past year in its attempts to automate and streamline its various data reporting systems. There are many pieces of information, some complex, others less so, which are collected every day by Job Service staff. Current practice now calls for the majority of this information to be entered daily into a computer data bank maintained at a central location in Baltimore. This daily entry includes information drawn from the 511 form (employee information data), the 516 form (job bank and other services) and the 514 form (job orders). In addition to being necessary for daily Job Service operations, all of this information is currently required by the U.S. Federal Government for the compilation of the ENDS (Employment National Data System) report.

Local offices process, record and forward information on a myriad number of activities and services to clients, based upon several categories of individuals. This information is kept current so that it may be used quickly. The information collected is also used to set placement and activity goals for each local office. Presently, daily data status reports and error lists are sent to local Job Service offices so that any errors in job listings may be corrected. Additionally, once a week the central offices sends to each local office a

summary report that reviews each office's activity. Finally, at the end of each month, the total activity of each office is summarized by local office and by station and desk. Monthly and cumulative year-to-date information is reported each month to central DET staff and quarterly to the Federal government. The basic data provided in these reports includes number of individuals placed, placement transactions, individuals counseled, UI claimants placed, job openings received, as well as other information.

During the past year, senior DET and Job Service officials have moved quickly to respond to local office needs to streamline the data reporting system. Day-to-day data entry problems of limited staff resources and machine down time continue to exist as they no doubt always will. Nevertheless, the Maryland Job Service has been moving effectively to improve its employees' ability to complete these tasks more efficiently in several ways. One way has been to increase the number of computer terminals within each local office, a process that is still ongoing. Another has been to increase the efficiency of the tie-lines to the central data repository. The Department is hopeful of beginning implementation of an ODDS (on-line data entry display system) in the Fall of 1985. This will allow easier movement for operators within the system, increase the ease and accuracy of data input and update, include WIN activity reporting (now

separate from the ESARs), provide greater job match capacity, as well as enhancing other data capabilities.

Two additional forthcoming changes to Maryland's data reporting system are of particular note. The first involves changes in the data base fields which will enable an easier and more accurate tie in to the National Job Bank, housed in Albany, New York. Currently, it is a cumbersome process to tie into this system and often the job opportunity information obtained is out of date by the time it becomes available. The new system will allow easier information entry and retrieval. Second, is the development of the Job Match program. Pilot tested in two local offices during 1984, this system will expand to all offices as soon as the availability of equipment makes it practicable to do so. Providing that the data entry has been done accurately, this unique program will allow Job Service personnel to provide an employer with a list of appropriately qualified persons on the day following the listing of the job. Matching can be done based on applicant skills, education level and other job requirements as specified by the employer. This system is intended to and should eliminate the need for the many tedious paper searches for candidates that is now a regular and time-consuming part of Job Service operations.

Other Job Service Activities

Counseling. Counseling activities in the Job Service offices are carried out by either designated counselors, or

other staff who have been asked to fill that job role. Counseling activities may include testing as requested by employers, GATB or SATB testing for applicants concerned about job choice or direction, job search workshops, or referral to other agencies if it has been determined that a specific need exists. Counselors, therefore, should be trained in counseling techniques and knowledgeable about testing techniques and interpretation. Not all offices have such persons. In at least one office, there was no designated counselor on the staff. In several others, the individuals functioning as counselors were untrained in relevant skills. This task is too important to be omitted from local office practice in part because interviewers rarely have time to adequately counsel applicants.

Testing. Testing conducted by Job Service offices is of two types: vocational testing of relevant job skills, such as typing or shorthand, or motor skills and coordination which might be requested by an employer; and, vocational aptitude testing with the GATB and/or SATB. Testing occurs in individual or group sessions. Results become a part of the applicant file and can be reported to the potential employer. Such testing can save the employer valuable time and resources and provides a level of assistance that is consistent with that which a private agency might offer. Vocational aptitude testing also can be included in the applicant profile and is most often used in conjunction with job search

workshops to assist applicants with job decisions. These results may or may not be discussed with the applicants, depending upon the skill of the test administrator and time constraints.

Job Search Workshops. Job search workshops are designed to assist applicants with developing those characteristics necessary for successful job hunting. These activities may take the form of three-day workshops or may be spread out over a longer period of time, depending upon staff and applicant desires and interest. Job search workshops include information on such activities as resume writing, interviewing and dress, and personal contact skills that have been determined to be necessary in successfully finding employment. Attendance at these workshops is voluntary and may take place at the Job Service office site or at some other location, such as a local community college or high school. In some cases, these activities are very important steps in the process of helping applicants become job ready.

Referral to Training. Referral to training takes place when it is determined both that an applicant desires it and/or the applicant might qualify for a specific training program offered through a local community college, business, or training school. By far, the largest number of training referrals for both veterans and non-veterans is to Job Training and Partnership ACT (JTPA) agencies. Some JTPA training activities are specifically designed for special

populations meeting employment and financial criteria. Veterans' programs provide for referrals for training with agencies other than JTPA. Once an applicant has been referred for training, the Job Service office may or may not be advised of a placement into training by the referral agencies. Unless the applicant voluntarily returns to the Job Service office after training, the Job Service may not be involved in the placement of this individual into employment. The training agency may place its trainees through its own placement activities, a situation which has created some tension between such agencies and some Job Service staff.

Targeted Jobs Tax Credit. This program is designed to allow employers to obtain a tax credit for their business when they hire certain eligible employees. It is most often used by fast food and other similar service industries and facilitates the hiring of youth, or others who qualify under its need guidelines. Job Service personnel are responsible for the certification of TJTC eligible persons, a task which must be done before the individual has been hired.

Food Stamps Program. Job Service personnel also function to certify the eligibility of food stamp recipients who are required to be involved in active job search efforts for this service. This activity is usually performed by a half-time person located in the Job Service office. Placements of food stamp persons are reflected in the placement activity of a specifically coded office rather than the local

office where it is carried out. Thus, these activities, which take time from interviewers who are still responsible for helping meet office placement goals, are often regarded as counter-productive to effective interviewer functioning.

Other Services. Other service activities include monitoring of migrant and seasonal farm workers employment and practices, alien labor certification, interstate listing and clearance, relocation assistance, on-site recruitment days, certification of certain social service clients, WIN assistance, a mammoth complaint system, and placement in summer youth programs. The migrant and seasonal farm workers' program is primarily active during peak growing seasons in certain localities, at which time it is responsible for a majority of office activity. This program has received much adverse publicity in the media to the apparent detriment of concerned Job Service staff performing what is essentially a monitoring task required by federal regulations.

Youth coordinators assist high school and college age youth during the summer as well as during the school year. In the larger offices, this activity occupies one individual full time, while in other offices, it is a part-time activity in addition to other interviewer activities.

Some Final Comments about Staff Perceptions of Job Service Activity

Managerial staff, as well as other professional staff, at the several offices surveyed all express similar frustrations: difficulty in filling support positions at various levels; the need for clerical and other support staff to decrease the number of non-professional, and especially record keeping, tasks that professional staff were asked to perform; the lack of adequate ESR support in order to provide more complete services to the employer community; the increased data reporting procedures; computer "down time" so that accurate record keeping is often stymied; lack of adequate and up-to-date equipment to assist applicants in completing their own job search through JIS; sometimes very poor physical facilities; the managers lack of ability to hire and fire local staff; the inability to carry out high visibility public relations and advertising for Job Service activities; the paucity of qualified and job-ready applicants for employment; the inability to require job search workshops for some job seekers who clearly need them; and, sometimes, personal frustrations with their seeming inability to have any significant input into the agency's decision-making process. All managers cited the constant shifting of personnel and the ever-changing nature of "pressing priorities" to which they need to respond immediately as other ongoing problems.

Despite these frustrations, the managers were supportive of their staff, and, generally, felt that the Job Service had an important service to offer to employers and to qualified applicants if only they could be enticed to use it. They, as well as their staff, voiced the opinion that the Job Service offered the public a large number of valuable services, centralized recruiting procedures, generally knowledgeable job development personnel, testing of applicants when requested, a JSEC committee for employer networking, and the possibility for enhanced job matching capability through the computerized match system currently being developed.

There appears to be a need, in the view of many of the employees, for a way in which to assess better the capability of applicants as job ready, to have a better ability to send only qualified applicants to interviews for positions, and to be able to check adequately the references and job history of applicants. In this way, they feel they can better serve the employer community. Additionally, it was felt by some that more of the responsibility for obtaining employment should rest with the applicant. It was thought that this might be accomplished through the establishment of an appointment system for applicants after an initial registration. It was also felt that applicants should be required to attend job search workshops if it is determined that they are not job-ready individuals. The enhanced counseling of clients is viewed as a must. The expanded use and development of the

individualized job information system would also be very helpful. There was also a significant concern about the lack of professional status of Job Service workers. This lack of professionalism is fostered by what some view as a low salary and a stunted career ladder.

It was apparent that the Job Service has a considerable need to improve and publicize its activities and image. All interviewees cited a lack of general awareness by the public and by employers about the activities that the Job Service does provide. Many felt that this poor image resulted from the co-location and close identification of the Job Service and Unemployment Insurance offices. Others felt co-location resulted in at least some applicants being referred to the Job Service by Unemployment Insurance personnel, and, additionally, that some employers favored continued co-location for various reasons. Other often-expressed needs were for the centralization of certain services and for the return of some services to agencies better equipped to handle them; alien labor certification, social services and food stamp certification activities, and migrant and seasonal farm workers programs and monitoring were the most frequently cited activities. Doing so would, it was felt, facilitate additional interview time to perform more adequately crucial services.

Part II

Review and Assessment of Coordination Activities

Coordination is a much sought after goal in the provision of public service in the United States. That this should be so is not very surprising. One of the most brilliant and durable social inventions of the American founding fathers was the notion of fragmenting government as a means of helping to preserve local control and individual liberty. Inevitably, however, a government that is fragmented, whether by level, branch, or function, is going to require coordination. This will especially be the case when financial resources are in short supply and the demand for a service comes from many individuals at many times and in many places.

Consequently, it is not surprising that questions are frequently raised about the extent to which employment and training activities, as well as social services in general, are effectively coordinated. In a fragmented system reform advocates will always see greater coordination as a means to greater efficiency and economy. In general, such a belief is probably an accurate one. Whether that is always the case, however, is by no means clear. Not only do efforts to coordinate the work of two or more agencies or governmental units require the expenditure of limited resources, but they also serve to lessen the likelihood that alternative service delivery opportunities will be available for those who may,

for a variety of legitimate reasons, require them. Thus, the absence of totally satisfactory coordination of public services may, in at least some instances, not necessarily be a bad thing.

In part for this reason, and in part because this is an area in which relationships have begun to change rapidly, it is especially difficult to draw the kind of clear-cut conclusions about the status of coordination that one would like. This is made even more difficult because the research staff is aware that over the past two years the improvement of coordination between the Job Service and the other deliverers of employment and training services within the State has been a major priority for the leadership of the new Department of Employment and Training. Evidence of this is seen in the fact that both the Job Service and JTPA program administration were placed under the same Assistant Secretary when the new Department was created.

The wisdom of the decision by DET's senior administrators to devote attention to the improvement of coordination between the Job Service and the JTPA program is readily evident. Despite considerable improvement over the past year, in some parts of the State of Maryland, the level of effective coordination between the Job Service and related agencies, such as the Service Delivery Areas, still ranges from very limited to virtually non-existent. There are certainly some significant exceptions to this general

situation that have emerged during the past two years and these will be noted in the following discussion. That the general problem remains, however, should not be altogether surprising. Whether accurate or not, the Job Service is often perceived by those organizations with whom coordination efforts should be undertaken as an insulated and not very responsive organization.

Compounding this problem is the fact that, for a variety of reasons, many Job Service employees appear still to hold to a highly negative view that emerged during the CETA years about working with JTPA Service Delivery Areas. For example, it is their perception that JTPA, unlike Job Service, has few problems with understaffing. Given that the cutbacks in staff that have occurred at the local level during the past four years are even greater than those that have taken place in the Job Service, it is unlikely that this is an accurate perception.

Job Service staff also believe that JTPA workers receive higher pay for performing functions similar in nature to those that they perform. This view has caused obvious resentment toward JTPA programs on the part of some Job Service employees, especially in those offices where JTPA intake personnel are placed. Some Job Service workers feel that, in order to maintain high success rates, JTPA programs are unwilling to work with welfare recipients or long-term unemployed persons. This, it is alleged, makes the JTPA

placement job easier because they work with the easier-to-place, better qualified applicants. This, in turn, it is suggested, further fosters the image of the Job Service as working with only the less educated, less qualified job seekers.

Additionally, both Job Service and JTPA personnel view some JTPA activities as duplicating the services already offered by the Employment Service. This overlap in services is perceived in some instances as directly advesarial and in other instances as complimentary. Many Job Service staff say they would like to see JTPA responsible only for training activities and have the Job Service be responsible for all job development and placement activities.

In the course of this research other grievances, real or alleged, were expressed by Job Service staff. Among them were the following: clauses written into Industrial Revenue Bonds (IRBs) used by some SDAs seem to exclude Job Service placement activity and insure that JTPA organizations have easy active placement activities; JTPA agencies were given easier access to on-the-job training programs; veterans were placed more quickly into training program slots; and, that in some localities, JTPA training activity was too highly specialized and not effective.

The coordination of PIC/JTPA organizations with the Job Service is mandated by the JTPA legislation. In light of the kinds of comments made by Job Service employees, it was

obviously necessary to attempt to assess the perceptions of SDA/JTPA personnel with regard to both coordination and the functioning of the Job Service in Maryland. Nine of the ten PIC/SDA groups were visited by the research staff. The degree of cooperation found to exist ranged from, in one instance, quite good to, in several instances, guarded but slowly improving to, in a few cases, very limited.

Frederick County seems to represent the State's preeminent success story in this regard. The Frederick JTPA organization JTA (Job Training Agency) appears to have a very good working relationship with the Frederick Job Service Office. This is in spite of the fact that under the old CETA program, relations between the two agencies were poor. Currently, things have improved to the point that the Job Service manager serves on the local PIC.

In general, there is a clear division of labor with the JTA viewed as the county's training arm and Job Service as the placement component in providing services to applicants. Several examples of coordination were observed. Dislocated workers are certified eligible by the JTA and with the Job Service verifying the determination. OJT contracts are listed with the Job Service, but the contracting and marketing of OJT is administered through JTA. The same person does marketing of clients for both organizations. All job search workshops for the Job Service are conducted by JTA. All applicants who complete vocational training enter job search

workshops and register with the Job Service, whose staff perform the needed job development functions. This coordination seems to be continuing to increase in that the JTA is currently seeking to find ways in which the efforts of all county agencies could be more effectively coordinated for individuals seeking work or retraining.

It has been suggested that the JTPA organizations have taken over many of the labor exchange functions that are already in place in the Job Service. Visits to other SDA facilities have led to the conclusion that, to some extent, this perception is well founded. For example, in one SDA several Job Service personnel were co-located at SDA centers. These Job Service staff were perceived as unwilling to participate in certain phases of the office's operation in a way that was counter-productive to its successful functioning. In fact, this difficulty appears to have been the result of overly strict attention by staff to Job Service job description guidelines. Although the latter problem appears to be rectified, some SDA staff still express the belief that the Employment Service has not brought any substantial skills to the collaborative efforts of the two organizations. Rather, the Job Service staff is perceived as enveloped in a proliferation of forms and procedures and unable to provide employers with the customized package of services that the SDA is able to offer. Not surprisingly, SDA staff readily admit to the duplication of certain activities because of, as

they put it, a belief that the Job Service is not fulfilling the needs of the local employer community.

In another instance, SDA cooperation was characterized as ranging from "very good to abysmal, depending upon the personalities and the workload." On the positive side, there is cooperation in the verification process for dislocated workers and access to UI data and job bank information. On the negative side, PIC staff report that they believe that WIN population never gets from Job Service to JTPA because of inadequate referral mechanisms, and that greater cooperation was needed in the area of OJT contracts and job orders. In addition, it was felt that some clear duplication of services was necessary because the Job Service was not equipped to deal with individuals who had completed high technology training and were seeking placement.

One SDA location, in which two Job Service offices are located, reported on a positive relationship with one office and a negative one with the staff at the other. The SDA staffs' perception was that the job placement processes of the Job Service could be much more streamlined. More effective directed placement of job-ready individuals in the right job would occur if the Job Service had the ability, as the SDA does, to check references and assure the employer of good potential workers. Another problem appeared to be that some Job Service staff had no interest in working to place individuals placed in training by the SDA. The reason

for this was that very few of these individuals resulted in placement credit for Job Service staffers since the possibility of partial placement credit does not exist. (This lack of partial placement credit was mentioned as a problem by other SDAs.) The Job Service was also viewed as lacking the expertise and funding necessary for the successful marketing of services to the employer community.

The Director of one SDA expressed the feeling that dealing with Job Service was sometimes difficult and that he was unable to deal directly with the Job Service personnel for which the SDA was paying and who were responsible to it for their performance. He indicated that the Job Service needed more aggressive recruitment practices for staff hiring, and, additionally, felt that staff rotation through various tasks in the Job Service could be a very important means to upgrade the skills and commitment of Job Service staff that had become very "settled and blase." The inability of the Job Service to offer well-marketed OJT contracts also hurt their efforts to appeal to the employer community.

One large SDA facility that was visited viewed its cooperative efforts with the local Job Service office as generally good, but felt that there were several problems that resulted from too highly centralized State control of some local office programs. Cooperation between the local office and the SDA occurred in several ways: cooperative

intake is performed by both groups, with SDA staff at the Job Service office one day per week; JTPA has funded TJTC staff persons at the Job Service operation during peak work times; Job Search workshops are conducted jointly at the SDA facility; dislocated worker certifications are handled by Job Service staff; special projects are often jointly developed and funded; and, sometimes joint marketing takes place for programs or training. Despite this, however, there are several problems. First, the local Job Service is very inaccessible to a majority of the area's population due to public transportation problems. Moreover, this office is overcrowded, often seems unruly and is ugly; all making it especially unappealing for prospective employers.

The SDA felt that marketing decisions were made too often at the State level, with little regard for local involvement and concerns, and that the State did not delegate the authority to its local offices which was needed in order for flexibility to be built into the system. It was felt that the Job Service should have more autonomous and smaller outreach offices that were closer to the population needs. It was also felt that Job Service salaries were inadequate to attract younger, well qualified ESRs who both suffered from low pay and had to compete with better paid job developers from other organizations. Because of this, the Job Service was not in a position to offer the consistent marketing of

services to business that is essential to successful functioning.

In summary, there was a consistency to perceptions at the SDA levels that relationships with the Job Service could be significantly improved. Likewise, there was a widespread belief that they were already much improved from pre-JTA days. It was apparent that there were some SDAs that desired increased cooperation and coordination. Most SDAs, however, felt justified in providing services that the Job Service also provides. This was due, in part, to the nature of the performance-based agreements that form the basis of their OJT and vendor contracts, and, in part, because of a belief, sometimes seemingly well founded, that some local employers would rather deal with their organization than the Job Service. In general, SDA employees did not agree with Job Service employees that they were better paid, although in some localities that was certainly true. The SDAs also believed that one large barrier to effective coordination was the Job Service's definition of placements and the way in which credit is granted for placement activity. Until that definition can be modified, there is a strong belief it will continue to create a barrier to the establishment of positive working relationships between the two organizations.

There can be no doubt that there is some duplication and overlap in the services provided by the Job Service and the JTPA programs. Such a situation may not necessarily be a

negative one, however, for any of several reasons. It is likely in some cases that there is a large enough demand for certain services as to justify the need for both organizations to provide similar efforts. Second, it is likely that competition strengthens both organizations. Third, it may be that one or the other group is not doing an adequate job and thus, alternative options are useful. Fourth, in some cases each group serves a different clientele.

In some instances, however, there does appear to be unwarranted duplication of services. In the course of this research we have seen cases of service duplication that fall into each of the categories noted above. It is not altogether clear from our investigation as to which type is the most frequent occurrence. What is evident, however, is that the clearly negative perceptions of each other held by some Job Service staff and SDA personnel certainly decreases the likelihood that positive interaction will take place. The initiation of steps to improve communications and understanding between the Job Service and related organizations such as the SDAs should continue to be a matter of high priority for all those involved in these matters. Certainly, significant progress has been made, especially during the past year, but there still remains much room for a good deal more improvement.

Part III

Influence of Federal Legal Framework on Job Service Operations

Many factors shape the manner in which the Job Service carries out its various functions. Among these are public attitudes, state laws and regulations, organizational structure, economic conditions in the State and Maryland's personnel policies. One of the factors influencing the Job Service about which considerable concern has been expressed is the impact of Federal statutory provisions and other directives which help to define those activities which the Job Service must perform and those over which it has discretionary powers.

Three basic missions have been ascribed to Job Service at various times. These include: 1) to provide labor exchange services; 2) to provide special employment services to UI recipients; and 3) to provide special employment services to the disadvantaged and long-term unemployed. While the Wagner-Peyser Act does not delineate a specific purpose for the Job Service, Section 7(a) of the Act sets out activities which are to be carried out by the Federal grant to the States. Two among these are important to note:

> 1)...job search and placement services to job seekers including counseling, testing, occupational and labor market information, assessment, and referral to employers; [and]

2)...appropriate recruitment services and special technical services for employers.

This language would not seem to target any special group among the general job-seeking population. While it might appear that UI recipients have been singled out, the law would appear to require that all services are to be provided to the general public as well as to the disadvantaged. The legal requirement for coordination between Job Service and JTPA organizations would seem to place an important emphasis upon special services to the disadvantaged population, but it is not to be interpreted as a mutually exclusive service from other Job Service labor exchange activities. Rather, the law does provide for special emphasis upon services to UI recipients and the disadvantaged within the context of the overall function as a labor exchange mechanism for the general population. Thus, it would appear that the agency mission should be to provide the variety of labor exchange activities to the general population of job seekers and employers, with special emphasis on the employment needs of the State's unemployed and disadvantaged workers.

A recently completed draft report prepared by the National Alliance of Businesses (NAB) (1985) for the Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), suggests that Federal directives fall into five basic categories:

1) Labor exchange activities;

2) Regulations governing the application of the "work test";

3) Provision of services to specifically targeted groups of individuals;

4) Labor law enforcement; and,

5) Provision of labor market information and special labor certification.

It is apparent from a review of this document that, while there do not appear to be an overwhelmingly large number of limitations imposed by Federal regulations, those that do exist are significant in their imposition of tasks on Job Service staff. In some cases they may duplicate services that are or could be provided by other Federal or state agencies, and, in many cases, they do not provide funding sources for the increased work activities. On the other hand, it must also be kept in mind that the same Federal government that imposes these tasks does bear the entire cost of funding the Maryland Job Service. What follows is a brief review of those activities mandated by law and regulation, indicating those that require substantial staff time and energy.

Labor Exchange Function

The Maryland Job Service, as the State's agent, must, under Wagner-Peyser regulations, assist job seekers and employers in filling jobs through some form of matching process, participate in interstate job matching, and provide application of the work test as required by Unemployment

Insurance laws and/or other state or federal laws requiring the application of work tests. Any other services related to these basic mandated functions are considered discretionary unless deemed as required by the appropriate state officer. The Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978 and the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 further extend the provision of basic labor exchange services. The Disaster Relief Act guarantees full employment services to those unemployed due to a major disaster. While it does not extend the list of services already provided through Wagner-Peyser, the NAB study suggests that expanded public awareness can have a significant effect on the workload of a local office without provision of additional funding for staffing to cover such emergency situations.

Work Test Application

State employment offices are required to take application for work from any individual filing a claim for Unemployment Insurance benefits under Title III of the Social Security Act, and subsequent legislation which might govern extended benefits regulations, as well as the provision of assistance to former Federal employees, ex-servicemen and women, disaster relief recipients, and those applying for Federal supplemental compensation. In addition, other Federal legislation requires that services be provided for WIN program registrants, Food Stamp program registrants, individuals applying for benefits under the Trade Readjust-

ment Act of 1974 and the Railroad Retirement Insurance Act. In these instances, the Job Service is required to "expose" claimants to "suitable" work.

In carrying out its labor exchange activities, the Job Service also exercises police powers in assessing whether a particular claimant is considered able and available for work and, consequently, must be actively seeking employment in order to receive UI payments. The law does provide, however, that compensation may not be denied to any eligible individual if they refuse to work under the condition of a labor dispute, refraining from or being required to join a union, or, most significantly, when the applicant is being asked to take or apply for a "substandard" job. It also provides that the individual, under certain circumstances, must be notified of the job in writing before the process for denial of benefits can begin.

The application of work tests relies heavily upon State interpretation worked out through the mutual agreement of the various agencies involved, rather than specifically mandated Federal rules and regulations, and, as such, implementation is somewhat ambiguous. Obviously, applying work tests under these conditions can become confusing and time consuming. There can be no doubt that the administering of the work tests sometimes requires duplicative activity. Often this is exacerbated because of a widely held perception that the primary function of the work test is not to locate a match

between a job seeker and an employer, but merely to police applicants for monies under social service programs.

In addition to the frustrations created by the lack of specific regulations, frequent complaints are heard about the cost involved in administering work tests. The funding of such activities is varied; in some instances direct funding is available through DOL, DHR, or DHHS. The NAB report notes that the Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service regulations include repeated references to assignments of duties to Job Service personnel as regards application of the work test for food stamps but that no funding is available. On the other hand, it is important to keep in mind that the Maryland Job Service is entirely federally funded and thus, it is not accurate to suggest that the Federal government is imposing program activity and not providing any funding.

Target Groups

Federal law requires that certain specified populations be targeted for special attention by the Job Service. Chief among these groups are veterans and persons determined to be eligible for special assistance by virtue of their relationship to a veteran. Certain Federal funds are ear-marked to state employment services to hire staff personnel whose sole function is to service veterans. There are two major areas of ambiguity regarding the provision of services to these individuals. One has to do with the requirement that these

persons be given first preference over non-veterans for available jobs. Contrary to routine practice, no specific time requirement for exclusive preference actually exists, although the language of the law and regulations does, where there are limited job resources, require some form of preference. The second area of confusion between legal requirements and actual practice involves the responsibility of the staff who must provide these services. While State practice is that designated veterans' service staff cannot carry out non-veterans' services, the NAB report does not indicate any legislation that would not allow such personnel to assist with other Job Service office duties as are necessary.

In addition to servicing veterans and other related individuals, Job Service personnel are required to provide cooperative activities for the coordinated delivery of employment services with State JTPA organizations, serve as recruitment and screening agency for the Job Corps, and provide assistance to other special populations such as AFDC recipients, the handicapped, Migrant Seasonal Farm Workers (MSFW) persons, WIN clients, and others. The NAB report indicates that because of the absence of additional funding, local Job Service offices may be hard pressed to provide an adequate array of Wagner-Peyser services to JTPA sponsors or service deliverers. As a consequence, in some localities in

Maryland, the JTPA or PIC does provide salary funding for Job Service staff to provide service to JTPA clients.

Additionally, the State employment offices must make determinations of Targeted Job Tax Credit (TJTC) eligible persons. Although not spelled out in the Federal regulations, TJTC eligible persons are supposed to register with the local Job Service office prior to seeking a job. In actuality, individuals often find a job and then are told by their prospective employer to go register at the Job Service office and receive eligibility for TJTC and then return to be "hired" by the employer. This process obviously creates some additional paper work for the Job Service office but also helps them meet placement quotas. JTPA organizations also provide TJTC determinations for prospective employers.

Service to the handicapped is similarly governed by Federal law and regulation. State employment services are required to have designated staff for serving the handicapped population. This is not an exclusive staff assignment, but implementing the regulations does require periodic review of the employment status of handicapped individuals in rehabilitation facilities. This requirement does appear somewhat duplicative of the activities of other agencies which service the handicapped population.

Labor Law Enforcement and Compliance

Under several acts regarding Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers (MSFW), employment services are required to maintain

a substantial complaint and referral system. The Job Service has the responsibility for maintaining a record of complaints involving this population from both employees and employers. Additionally, the Job Service is responsible for recording and referring non-job service related complaints which allege violations of employment related laws to other agencies such as OSHA. The Job Service is also responsible for the inspection of migrant housing before providing recruitment services to an employer listing agricultural jobs with the Job Service when another competent agency cannot provide such inspection in a timely fashion. Additionally, the Job Service is responsible for the filing of certifications of registrations for agricultural work by non-U.S. workers and transferring such applications to the appropriate agency. Such activities (the cost of which are charged to Title IX of the Social Security Act, the DOL, or OSHA), obviously require large commitments of time by some local office staffs during peak growing and harvesting seasons.

Job Service offices are also required to accept mandatory listings, solicit job orders, and make available information on contractor compliance and affirmative action for those contractors who have entered into a contract with the Federal government of $10,000 or more. This requirement does not carry with it enforcement powers and is time consuming but not cost effective in localities with "First Source" agreements for IRBs or where the contractor is forced

to list job openings, but has no obvious intention of hiring personnel through the Job Service.

Labor Market information

Under several regulations, the Job Service maintains a substantial Labor Market Information system, both for state reporting of information and for providing information and technical assistance to local SDAs and other planning agencies. While time consuming and sometimes complicated, these activities are necessary for successful Job Service functioning and any serious planning efforts.

Part IV

Employer Perceptions of the Maryland State Job Service

Historically, State Employment Services have suffered from the problems of negative images held by both citizens and job seekers. Nowhere has this problem seemed to be more severe than in the case of private sector employers - many of whom are alleged to hold a highly negative image of the state Job Service, not only in Maryland but all across the country. Consequently, one particularly important element of this study of the Maryland State Employment Service has involved obtaining an accurate picture of the attitudes and perceptions held by the State's employer community about its Job Service. Some understanding of these attitudes and perceptions can and have been obtained through the visits made by study staff to individual State Employment Service offices. Such observations, however, are, of necessity, highly impressionistic. Consequently, a survey of a selected sample of the State's employers was undertaken for the purpose of generating additional data about the Job Service.

A computer program was developed that would draw a random sample of employers from the State of Maryland's Unemployment Insurance rolls. While this proved more technically difficult than initially anticipated, the effort was nevertheless successful and the sample drawn. It was subsequently expanded slightly by adding to the sample the

State's twenty largest firms in terms of number of employees, as well as the State's twenty largest firms with regard to total annual sales. A mail-survey questionnaire was developed and sent to the selected representative sample of slightly over 500 employers from throughout the State of Maryland during November, 1984. Subsequently, follow-up reminders were sent to all employers in the sample who had not responded to the first mailing.

One hundred and eighty-six fully or partially completed questionnaires were returned, a return rate of 37%, considered good for a mail questionnaire and adequate for statistical analysis. Frequency of response to each question was tabulated and comparisons were made between those employers who had utilized the Job Service within the last two years and those who had not. Responses to significant questions were also examined with regard to size and type of employers.

Table 1 provides the response frequency distribution for each item for the sample of 186 employer respondents. It should be noted at the outset that not all respondents answered every applicable question, and, thus, missing responses were not counted in the totals for each question nor in the tabulation of percentages. Similarly, when cross-tabulations of results were run, missing data were eliminated from the statistical analyses.

The employer sample is composed of 186 firms from throughout the State of Maryland. The largest portion of the sample (29%) reported being involved in the services industry, with 23% in retail or wholesale trades, 13% manufacturing, 9% construction trades, 8% in government or public administration, and 13% being distributed among the others. The average length of time that the sample of employers had done business in Maryland is 24 years, with 43% reporting ten or fewer years at their present location. The size of the workforce varied from nine firms which reported only a single employee to 18 firms reporting a workforce of 1000 or more employees. The average workforce size for the sample of 184 employers responding was 189 employees. Twenty-three percent of the firms surveyed reported being a part of a larger parent organization.

Two additional items of descriptive importance are worthy of note. First, about 20% of the firms surveyed reported that their company had experienced either an increase or decrease in staff during the past year and a similar number anticipated changes during the coming year. The construction industry reported changes most often during the prior year, followed by the manufacturing industry. The construction trades were the sector of the economy that most often anticipated a change in the number of employees for the upcoming year. It was followed in the latter regard by

government and public administration, and manufacturing and wholesale-retail trade.

A second area of interest involves the use of unskilled workers since this is a category of workers who are frequently served by state employment services. Fifty percent of the firms responding said that they employed unskilled workers, but 68% of those with unskilled labor force classifications reported that such workers represented less than 25% of their work force. Of the total sample of employers responding, 89% (163/183) reported that from less than 25% to none of their workers fell into this classification. Only 28% (52/184) of the firms reported that their workforce was composed of 50% or more employees classified as professional, technical or managerial. Nine percent reported 50% or more clerical staffing, 13% had staffs primarily composed of skilled workers, and 7% reported a high percentage of semi-skilled workers.

For the purposes of this study, the three most important issues were, first, whether or not employers had used the Job Service within the last two years; second, whether this use of Job Service activity was an important factor in determining participation in and awareness of other employment and training programs; and third, the perceptions of employees regarding the Job Service, its services and related programs.

Perhaps the single most significant finding of this survey had to do with the lack of recent use of the Job

Service by many of the State's employers. Quite clearly, many of the State's employers have had very little experience with, and probably knowledge of, the Job Service. Of the 186 employers responding to the questionnaire, 66, or 35.5%, reported having used the Job Service within the last two years, while 59.7% responded negatively, and nine, or 4.8%, did not know whether their company had utilized its services. Use of the Job Service was evenly distributed among small, moderate, and large size firms. However, of those firms not using Job Service, 84 of 109, or 75%, were firms reporting 50 or fewer employees. Two-thirds, or 137 of the employers responding, did not know or could not remember the name and location of the local Job Service office that their company would use if it wanted to do so. Importantly, 91% of those who had not used the Job Service also did not know which office they would use.

It is often said that employers only list lower-level jobs with the state employment service. This data would appear to confirm this belief. The largest number of firms listing jobs with the Job Service, 47%, listed clerical positions. Surprisingly, however, 21% of the firms listing positions had listed professional, technical and managerial positions. Services, machine trades and materials-handler positions were listed with equal frequency. Interestingly, of the firms reporting a high percentage of clerical staff, only 25% had used Job Service, but 58% of those with large,

semi-skilled labor forces reported having used job Service to fill vacancies and 42% with large, unskilled labor forces reported using Job Service. The manufacturing industry utilized the Job Service most frequently (61%), with the construction (33%) and services (34%) industries next most frequently. The lowest use of the Job Service was reported by government organizations.

The notion that employers use the Job Service for listing lower-level jobs was further confirmed by the data on the salary levels of the jobs that employers reported having listed. Fourteen percent of jobs listed were at minimum wage. Over 50% of the jobs listed paid between $3.50 and $5.50 per hour. However, 10% of the jobs listed paid between $8.00 and $10.00 per hour. Thus, the data suggest that, while the Job Service doesn't receive only low paying jobs, the average listed wage is still in the low range.

Those firms who list openings with the Job Service tend most frequently to list only once per year, although 42% reported listing from two to ten times per year. The listings occur sporadically with no particular time pattern, thus making it difficult to anticipate overload periods for Job Service workers except in those localities which register and monitor Migrant Seasonal Farm Workers. Most employers felt that their orders were taken promptly, but commented that it would be useful for Job Service personnel to take more detailed job descriptions in order that better referrals

could be made. It was felt that referrals should be made based not only on DOT classifications, but also, and, more importantly, on a good match of skill qualifications.

One of the surprising findings of this survey, given that common wisdom seems to hold that employers are not happy with the Job Service, is that most employers who use the Job Service are quite pleased with many of the services that they receive. Sixty-three percent of the users reported that the Job Service was helpful in filling their vacancies, many enthusiastically so. Several employers reported, however, that the job Service had sent poor quality, too many, or unqualified referrals to them. The employers felt strongly that better job matching was necessary and that the Job Service should work to build its capacity in that area. In particular, it should do more detailed work history and reference checks on those candidates it refers for employment.

The Job Service policy of moving towards the goal of having a single staff member working regularly with a particular employer is widely endorsed by employers. Forty-eight percent of the employers reported being able to speak with the same Job Service representative when placing a job order, but 80% of them felt that it would be very beneficial to their company's needs if it were possible to speak with the same person each time they called. Several employers emphasized this need for consistency in their

dealings with the Job Service and additionally recommended that Job Service personnel visit employers' operations in order to gain a better knowledge of their firm's needs and working environment.

All employers were asked to respond to a series of questions regarding their knowledge and/or use of Job Service activities and the effectiveness of the services provided. Once again, the most striking result is that knowledge about and awareness of Job Service activities is relatively limited among the State's employers. The two services most frequently known about and used were the placement activities and the TJTC programs. Of the other programs, while some respondents do report knowing about them, not many report using them. Several employers commented that their lack of awareness of the Job Service and its programs did not permit them to respond to this question, and the data strongly suggest that this absence of awareness was one of the most important failings in Job Service operations. Many stated that Job Service had a definite need to publicize its programs more extensively, especially to new businesses coming into the State and one employer commented that he had not seen any update or information regarding Job Service's programs in the last three years (with the exception of the veterans' programs which are being highly publicized in an effort to market the EVJTA).

The Job Service was rated as very effective to adequate by 38 of 186 employers. While this seems quite low, it is important to note that fully 61% of the employers either did not know how they would rate the Job Service (this rating was evenly distributed across all industry types) or had no opinion at all. Of interest was the fact that of those who had rated the Job Service, 44% rated it adequate, 43% rated if effective or very effective, and only 13% rated it inadequate. Small and moderate size firms were more likely to rate the Job Service as adequate (52% of each), while large firms (55%) were more likely to rate it as effective or very effective.

Thirty-six percent (68 of 186) of the employers surveyed would recommend the use of Job Service to other employers and 10% would recommend use of the Job Service with some reservations. Only 7% would not recommend the use of the Job Service. Significantly, 47% of the employers surveyed either didn't know if they would recommend Job Service or had no opinion. There appeared to be few variations when comparing the results of these two questions. The majority of those responding positively about the effectiveness of the Job Service also responded positively regarding their recommendation of the Job Service.

At the conclusion of this questionnaire, employers were asked to provide their opinion about employment and training activities beyond simply the services provided by the Job

Service. Once again, what stands out is the very limited knowledge of employers about these activities. This suggests it is not only the Job Service, but, additionally, all aspects of employment and training services about which employers have very limited knowledge. Only 9% of the employers surveyed were members of a JSEC committee, 10% were members of their local PIC. Fourteen percent reported that their company was involved in JTPA training programs. Of those employers who had used the Job Service, 41% reported not being members of a JSEC committee and 57% had never heard of it. PIC membership was reported at 75% among those who had used Job Service.

There was also a significant relationship between the use of Job Service and use of JTPA programs. Twenty-seven percent of those employers who had used Job Service also had been involved in JTPA training, while only 6% of those that had not used the Job Service reported similar involvement. It is interesting to note that, among all employers, 21% reported in favor of expanding public sector training activities, but 51% did not express any opinion at all on this question. However, when choosing employment and training activities that employers wished to see expanded, respondents chose public-funded training activities over all others (52%).

It was especially enlightening, given the fact that one frequently hears much criticism in the media of the "poor"

Maryland business climate, that while only five respondents rated the State's business climate "poor," six respondents rated it "excellent," 79 thought it "good," and 57 found it "fair." Quite clearly, the data suggest that the State's employers feel much more favorably about the Maryland business climate than popular wisdom suggests. This would certainly seem to suggest that while the State still has some work to do in this area, that may involve image building as much as it does significant policy change.

Finally, it is interesting to note the responses to the item that deals with employers' opinions toward the co-location of Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service offices. Once again, the data seem both to contradict popular belief and to illustrate further the reality that many employers are either not well informed about Job Service activities or alternatively lack strong feelings about them. Eighteen percent of the respondents indicated that they favored physical separation of the two offices while only 12% opposed it. Perhaps, most significantly, however, 69% either didn't know or had no opinion about the issue.

In summary, what stands out very clearly from this data is the apparent lack of awareness by Maryland employers of the services offered by the Job Service. This general conclusion of the existence of an information or awareness gap with regard to the Job Service and its activities on the part of Maryland employers certainly complements the impres-

sions that were obtained through site visits. Numerous Job Service staff in several different offices indicated their personal frustration about the lack of awareness by many of the employers who they hope to serve and extend the services of the Job Service. The survey data certainly confirmed the accuracy of these expressed frustrations.

TABLE 1
Response Frequency Distribution
of Employer Perspective of
Job Service

	N	%
Total Respondents		
Sample - 186		
Company Part of Larger Organization		
Yes	42	23
No	142	77
Industry Types		
Services	53	29
Retail Trade	30	17
Manufacturing	23	13
Government, Public Administration	16	9
Construction	15	8
Wholesale Trade	12	7
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	10	6
Agriculture, Fishing, Forestry	8	1
Transportation, Communications, Utility	8	1
Mining	2	1
Non-Profit	2	1
Other	3	2
Length of Time at Location		
0-10 Years	74	43
11-20 Years	34	20
21-40 Years	20	12
31-40 Years	9	5
41-50 Years	10	6
50-100 Years	17	10
100 +	9	5
Anticipate Change in Employees Number Next Year		
Yes	38	21
No	119	64
Don't Know	28	15
Employee Number Changed Last Year		
Yes	36	20
No	149	80

	N	%
Size of Workforce at Facility		
0-50	100	55
51-100	14	8
101-150	10	5
151-200	7	4
201-250	4	2
251-300	2	1
301-400	5	1
401-500	4	2
501+	28	15
Variable	4	2
Percentage of Workers Classified as:		
Professional, Technical, Managerial		
0%	27	n/a
1-25	67	n/a
26-50	38	n/a
51-75	23	n/a
76-100	29	n/a
Clerical/Service		
0%	44	n/a
1-25	93	n/a
26-50	30	n/a
51-75	9	n/a
76-100	7	n/a
Skilled		
0%	92	n/a
1-25	45	n/a
26-50	22	n/a
51-75	14	n/a
76-100	10	n/a
Semi-Skilled		
0%	95	n/a
1-25	54	n/a
26-50	22	n/a
51-75	10	n/a
76-100	2	n/a
Unskilled		
0%	121	n/a
1-25	42	n/a
26-50	8	n/a
51-75	6	n/a
76-100	6	n/a

	N	%
Percentage of Workers Classified as:		
Other		
0%	176	n/a
1-25	5	n/a
26-50	1	n/a
51-75	0	n/a
76-100	1	n/a
Job Service Office Likely Choice		
Eastpoint	3	2
Eutaw St.	10	6
Salisbury	3	2
College Park	1	1
Wheaton	4	2
Towson	3	2
Annapolis	5	3
Glen Burnie	1	1
Easton	3	2
Frederick	1	1
Westminster	1	1
Ocean City	1	1
Chestertown	1	1
Crisfield	2	1
Snow Hill	1	1
Leonardtown	1	1
Don't Know	137	77
Useful if Job Service Office Closer		
Yes	16	9
No	110	60
Don't Know	57	31
Listed with Job Service in past 2 years		
Yes	66	36
No	111	60
Don't Know	9	5
Job Types Listed		
Clerical	31	47
Professional, etc.	14	21
Other Service	13	20
Material Handler	13	20
Machine Trades	11	17
Sales	7	11
Domestic	8	12
Other	8	12
Structural Work	5	8
Transportation	5	8
Benchwork	3	5
Farm, Forestry	1	2
Processing	2	3

	N	%
Most Common Salary Level		
minimum wage	9	14
$3.50 - $4.00	22	33
$4.50 - $5.50	15	23
$6.00 - $8.00	12	18
$8.00 - $10.00	3	5
$10.00 and above	3	5
Don't Know	2	3
How Often Used Job Service		
once a year	26	41
2-10 times/yr.	27	43
At least once/month	8	13
More frequently than once a month	2	3
Company's Use of Job Service		
Sporadic with no particular pattern	55	82
Seasonally determined	6	9
Evenly spaced throughout the year	5	8
Determined by contractual agreements	1	2
Job Order Placed Promptly by Service		
Yes	53	79
No	4	6
Don't Know	10	15
Talked with Same Service Representative		
Yes	31	48
No	14	22
Don't Know	20	31
Helpful if Same Representative Available		
Yes	53	80
No	3	5
Don't Know	10	15
Job Service Helpful in Filling Vacancies		
Yes	41	63
No	15	23
Don't Know	9	14
Job Service was Advised of Applicant's Hiring		
Yes	40	64
No	6	10
Don't Know	17	27

Planning to Use Job Service Again	N	%
Yes	33	49
No	2	3
Don't Know	33	49

Why Used Job Service		
Needed employees	17	n/a
Other various reasons	17	n/a
Add'l recruitment	11	n/a
Convenient	13	n/a
Cost savings	7	n/a
Fed. contract obligation	8	n/a
Best source available	10	n/a
Only source known	4	n/a
Temporary help	1	n/a

Occupations Company Will List		
Clerical	30	n/a
Other service	23	n/a
Other	23	n/a
Professional	8	n/a
Domestic	6	n/a
Sales	6	n/a
Transportation	3	n/a
Materials Handler	4	n/a
Benchwork	1	n/a
Processing	2	n/a
Structural Worker	1	n/a
Non-exempt Status	1	n/a

Occupations Not Willing to List	N	%
Professional	19	n/a
Other	4	n/a
Sales	3	n/a
Machine Trades	1	n/a
Other Service	2	n/a

Employment Services: Knowledge of and Use

	Have Knowledge	Have Used	Are Effective	Are not Effective
Placement Activities Only	50	50	33	6
Testing (Vocational Aptitude)	46	10	7	5
Job Development	35	3	3	4
On-site Placement	35	5	3	4
Job Service Office Placement	29	7	8	5
Job Find Club	19	3	3	3
Targeted Jobs Tax Credit (TJTC)	45	22	14	3
On-The-Job Training	38	11	7	1
Emergency Veterans Training	29	3	3	2
Other Training	21	2	3	2
JSEC Committee	16	6	5	2
Counseling	24	2	2	3

	N	%
Employment Service Rating		
Very Effective	9	5
Effective	33	18
Adequate	27	15
Inadequate	4	2
Don't Know	81	44
No Opinion	32	17
Plusses in Job Service		
Convenient	15	n/a
Other	13	n/a
Good relationship with local office	7	n/a
Quick response to needs	7	n/a
Helps job seekers	4	n/a
Groundwork already done	4	n/a
Don't Know	18	n/a
No added fees	5	n/a
Disappointments with Job Service		
Poor screening before referral	12	n/a
Unable to preform job	13	n/a
Lack of knowledge	3	n/a
Too large	2	n/a
People don't show for interviews	2	n/a
Poor training programs	1	n/a
Policy changes too frequently	2	n/a
Other	9	n/a
Turnaround time problem	10	n/a
Suggestions to Job Service		
No suggestions		n/a
Promote services better	20	n/a
Screen referrals more effectively	15	n/a
Upgrade criteria for applicants/more skilled applicants	7	n/a
Get better details from employers	8	n/a
Better turnaround time needed	3	n/a
Train better	2	n/a
Provide worker transportation	1	n/a
Other	9	n/a

	N	%
Physically Separate Job Service Office from Unemployment Office		
Favor separation	34	18
Oppose separation	23	12
Don't Know	97	52
No Opinion	32	17
Company Member of Job Service Employer Committee (JSEC)		
Yes	15	9
No	57	35
Don't Know	27	17
Never heard of it	63	39
Company Member of Private Industry Council		
Yes	16	10
No	71	44
Don't Know	25	16
Never heard of it	49	30
Company Involved in JTPA Training Programs		
Yes	23	14
No	96	57
Don't Know	23	14
Never heard of it	26	16

Effectiveness Rating of Training Activities

	Poor	Adequate	Effective	Very Effective	Don't Know	Missing Info
Training through Job Training Partnership Act	0	8	6	2	109	61
Vocational Education in Public Schools	7	13	14	6	83	63
Government Funding of On-The-Job Training of New Employees	5	12	5	3	96	65
Community College Training (other than JTPA)	3	10	14	5	90	64
Training Under Former CETA Activities	12	13	4	1	92	63
Private Training Schools	2	9	12	0	84	67
Training Provided by Your Own Company for Current Employees	5	13	25	16	61	66
Other (Please Specify)	0	2	2	0	67	115

	N	%
Expand Public Sector Training Activities		
Yes	39	21
No	27	15
Maybe	25	13
Don't Know	54	29
No Opinion	41	22
Training Activities Employer Wishes to See Expand		
Training Activities through JTPA	6	10
Vocational Education in Public Schools	22	36
Government Funding of On-The-Job Training of New Employees	4	7
Other	27	44
Private Training Schools	1	2
Training provided by own company	2	3
Projected Beneficiaries From Expanded Public Sector Training Activities		
Youth	83	n/a
Disadvantaged Populations	81	n/a
Laid Off Employees From Other Companies (Unrelated Industry)	59	n/a
Laid Off Employees From Other Companies (Related Industry)	55	n/a
Laid Off Employees From Your Company	45	n/a
New Employees of Your Company	42	n/a
Current Employees of Your Company	32	n/a

	N	%
Recommend Job Service		
Recommend Without Reservation	21	11
Recommend	47	25
Recommend With Reservation	19	10
Would Not Recommend	12	7
No Opinion	86	46
Don't Know	1	1
Marvland Business Climate Rating		
Excellent	6	3
Good	79	43
Fair	57	31
Poor	5	3
Don't Know	12	7
No Opinion	27	15

Part V

Applicant Perceptions of the Maryland State Job Service

A second important element of this study of the Maryland State Job Service involved a survey of individuals seeking employment through Job Service offices. A random sample of approximately 330 active applicants and about 1000 inactive applicants was ultimately chosen by a computerized random search and selection process. This sample was drawn with the assistance of DET staff from the complete applicant pool listed with the Job Service. A sample was chosen for each local office in a stratified random fashion, selecting males and females, and for ethnic code in proportion to that office's proportion of the total State listings.

Telephone interviews were conducted by the research staff over the Summer and during the early Fall, 1984. Attempts were made to reach all 1330 persons on the sample listing. The telephone interviewers were able to complete only 100 interviews from this total sample, and then only after repeated attempts to reach many of the individuals. Most of the 1000 individuals listed as inactive could not be reached at all. There were several reasons that account for this: applicant did not have a telephone; applicant had moved; telephone had been disconnected; inaccurate phone numbers were listed with the Job Service; applicants claimed that the wrong person was listed on the sample rolls.

Table 2 presents a frequency distribution of the responses of the respondents to each of items on the questionnaire (which is presented in Appendix II). Forty-three males and fifty-seven females were interviewed. More than one-half of the applicants interviewed were between 17 and 30 years old, reflecting the fact that unemployment is higher among younger workers. Eighty-four of the applicants were high school graduates, had had some college, or were college graduates. Of this sample, 45 were employed when interviewed; 55 reported still being unemployed at the time of the interview. Of the 45 who were employed, eight had located their job through the aid of the Job Service.

A large proportion of the sample (44) had visited Unemployment Insurance offices. While 39 of these persons had heard about Job Service activities from Unemployment Insurance personnel, only 13 reported having actually registered with Job Service because it had been required of them by unemployment insurance regulations. In response to the series of questions about their use of the Job Service, it would appear that at least 75% of the applicants had not been told about many of the Job Service activities available to them. In addition, an even larger percentage of the applicants had not used the services, even when they knew of their existence. The one service that appears most frequently utilized is the self-service microfiche listings. This

finding suggests that increasing the self-service facilities for job seekers would be a worthwhile effort.

Most applicants expressed the feeling that the Job Service staff were professional and helpful, although fewer felt that the staff seemed personally interested in them. Seventy of the 100 applicants reported that they would recommend Job Service, although, when they had first registered, only 35 had thought initially that the Job Service would be able to help them locate a job. As noted above, only eight of the 45 reporting that they were employed had actually located their present position through Job Service efforts. Of those still unemployed at the time of the interview, 42 of the 55 reported that they would continue to use the Job Service, even though 50% of them felt that there were other, more effective, sources for locating employment.

Employed respondents reported that they had been registered with the Job Service for about two to four months before locating a job. At least one-third indicated that they had taken a different type of job or had received on-the-job training. One-fourth of employed respondents reported having taken a cut in pay in their new job.

Over one-half of the still employed respondents reported having been listed with Job Service over twelve months. They were, for the most part, still wiling to enter training, join a job search workshop, take a different type of job, or take a cut in pay. These results suggest that it might be

worthwhile to consider a call-back system for applicants who listed a significantly long period of time with Job Service in order to assess their job-ready status and offer additional services.

These results detail an important picture of applicant use of and needs from the Job Service. Significantly, almost one-half of the respondents cited lack of training and a lack of job skills as important barriers to reemployment. One-third reported that a lack of appropriate education, the need for increased job finding skills, former wages that were too high, and age as additional significant barriers. When comparing these responses to the small number of persons who had been appraised of job search workshops, vocational counseling, and training programs, it would appear that the Job Service has a definite need to increase public awareness of its activities; a need that was voiced by the employees of the Job Service, and alluded to in the results of the employer questionnaire.

Analyses were conducted comparing the experiences of those who are employed and those unemployed, as well as determining service to applicants based on other factors. These results did not indicate any significant differences in perception of Job Service activity, in attitude towards the Job Service, or in the use applicants made of the Job Service services offered to them. However, when combined with the information obtained from the survey of the employer communi-

ty, the results do further enhance our understanding of the Job Service and its activities as perceived by its users. In this regard they certainly serve to reinforce the conclusion that significant steps must be taken to enhance public awareness of and understanding of Job Service activities.

TABLE 2

Frequency Distribution of
Employment Service Client Questionnaire Responses

Number of Respondents: 100

Sex	
43	Male
57	Female

Race	
63	White
36	Black
1	Other

Age	
41	17-25
22	26-30
12	31-35
10	36-40
6	41-45
8	46 and over

Now Employed	
45	Yes
55	No

Located present job through Service	
8	Yes
33	No

Size of Job Service office visited	
20	Smallest
15	Small
22	Medium
17	Large
25	Largest
1	Unknown

Veterans	
21	Yes
79	No

Educational Level	
4	Eighth grade or less
12	Ninth to eleventh grade
60	High school graduate
18	Some college
6	College graduate

Persons in Household	
27	1-2
49	3-4
19	5-6
1	7-8
1	9-10
1	10 or more

Own home	
35	Yes
63	No

How long owned	
2	one week - six months
2	six months - one year
5	one - three years
3	four - six years
4	six - ten years
5	ten - fifteen years
3	fifteen - twenty years
2	twenty or more years

Renting

15	House
14	Apartment
4	Room

How long renting

3	six months or less
5	six months - one year
7	one - two years
13	two or more years

Sold House

1	Yes
56	No

Live with

32	Spouse and children
32	Other immediate family
6	Friend
5	another family
2	Other family members

Assistance used

44	Unemployment Insurance
17	Food stamps
11	Fuel assistance
11	Medicaid
10	Welfare
5	Aid to Families with Dependent Children
3	Emergency shelter
2	Other

What barriers to employment

46	Lack of training
44	Lack knowledge - job skills
34	The economy
33	Lack of education
33	Transportation
30	Lack job-finding skills
27	Former wages too high
23	Age
22	Too much experience
16	Personal appearance
15	Expect call-back from layoff
12	Office politics
6	Other

Marital status changed since unemployed

20	Yes
76	No

Why registered with Job Service

13	Required by Unemployment Insurance
32	Recommended by someone
7	It was free
1	Wife or husband recommended
1	Recommended by last employer
42	Other

How heard about the Employment Service

14	Friends
39	Unemployment Insurance personnel
8	Family members
2	Employer
15	Knew about it
8	Advertisements
7	Didn't know
5	Other

How long unemployed before registering

24	one - two weeks
4	three- four weeks
2	five - six weeks
3	six - eight weeks
4	over eight weeks
13	three - four months
9	four - six months
26	over six months
15	don't know/unsure

Seen promptly at Job Service office

69	Yes
26	No

How long had to wait

10	20-3- minutes
11	30 - 60 minutes
5	1 - 2 hours
7	over two hours
5	don't remember

Many people waiting to see interviewers

48	Yes
46	No
5	Don't remember

How many there, the first time

45	0-10
20	11-20
10	21-30
5	31-40
0	41-50
6	50 or more

How often went to Service in the last nine months

23	once
15	twice
21	3-4 times
18	five or more times
11	unsure

If didn't go, called about jobs

23	Yes
66	No
1	Don't remember

How often called

5	once
4	twice
4	3-4 times
11	over 4 times
1	unsure
75	Not Applicable

Job Service referrals or interviews

66	Yes
27	No

Times sent on interviews by Job Service in last year

26	once
18	twice
13	3-4 times
7	5-6 times
5	over six times

Would liked to have had job

53	Yes
17	No

Job seemed appropriate

49	Yes
17	No
2	Unsure

How many interviews did you go to

47	0 - 2
16	3 - 5
4	6 - 10

How many of these held at Service office

64	0 - 2
1	3 - 4
1	more than five

Type of job looking for

7	professional, technical, managerial
26	clerical
9	sales
5	domestic
11	other service worker
2	processing
8	machine trades
4	benchwork
3	structural worker
3	motor, freight, transp.
3	package/materials handler
6	other
11	any
1	unsure

Job looking for same as job before unemployed

61	Yes
29	No
3	Both

What was job before unemployed

4	professional, technical, mgrl.
4	sales
1	domestic
13	other service worker
2	farm
2	processing
3	machine trades
3	structural worker
3	other
1	varied
5	N/A

Had training to perform different job

15	Yes
13	No

Did register for jobs other than first choice

34	Yes
60	No

What were other job choices

6	clerical
9	sales
2	domestic
3	service
1	farm
1	benchwork
1	structural
1	package handler
3	other
8	any
1	N/A

Have had training for these

19	Yes
12	No

Job Service offered

20	mostly clerical
5	mostly sales
1	mostly domestic
14	mostly service worker
1	mostly processing
8	mostly machine trades
3	mostly structural worker
1	mostly motor freight
9	mostly package/materials handler
15	mostly other types
16	shown only what I asked for

What were salaries like for above jobs

45	Minimum wage
27	around $4 to $5 per hour
5	around $6 to $8 per hour
1	more than $8 per hour
13	don't know
4	varied
5	N/A - no jobs offered

Was this wage acceptable

50	Yes
31	No

Why respondent believes employers list jobs with the Service

12	Only minimum wage jobs
7	Only when they must by law
7	Only when there is no other way
1	Only when company doesn't have its own personnel office
1	Only when non-union jobs open
14	Only with low-level, entry jobs
60	Unsure

Former employer used Job Service

17	Yes
49	No
25	Don't know

Were told of other services

	YES	NO	DON'T REMEMBER
vocational counseling	15	82	2
vocational testing	13	83	3
training programs	32	65	1
Job Finders Club	10	87	2
job location assistance	9	81	1
relocation assistance	9	89	1
veterans program	23	57	13
National Job Bank/interstate	13	84	1
job service listings (microfiche)	39	57	3
employer recruitment days	5	91	1

Have used other services of Job Service

			EFFECTIVE?	
	USED	DID NOT	YES	NO
vocational counseling	3	96	2	1
vocational testing	6	93	4	2
training programs	6	93	3	3
Job Finders Club	2	97	1	1
job location assistance	3	96	1	2
relocation assistance	2	97	1	1
veterans programs	5	94	5	0
National Job Bank/interstate	3	96	2	1
Job Service listings/microfiche	24	75	10	10
employer recruitment days	0	99	0	0

Characteristics of people at Job Service office

	YES	NO
friendly	91	8
angry	8	91
helpful	84	15
cold	14	85
interested in you	68	28
bored	26	72
able to answer questions	89	7
well-mannered	92	6

Interviewers appear to be professional

63	Yes
9	No
25	Some yes, some no
2	No opinion

How do you rate the Job Service

17	1 (lowest)
15	2
34	3
20	4
11	5 (highest)

How helpful did you believe Job Service would be

17	Not very
20	Very little
27	Unsure
16	Somewhat helpful
19	Very helpful

Would you refer someone to the Service

62	Yes
28	No
8	With reservations

QUESTIONS FOR CURRENTLY EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS

How long worked at this job

13	1 week - 2 months
10	2 - 4 months
9	4 - 6 months
5	6 - 12 months
9	longer than 12 months

Kind of industry

2	government/public utilities
1	agriculture/forestry/fishing
3	construction
10	manufacturing
2	transportation, communication, utilities
1	wholesale trade
8	retail trade
3	finance
15	services

Kind of work performed now

4	professional
8	clerical
5	sales
1	domestic
13	service
8	machine trades
2	structural worker
2	motor transport
2	package handler
1	other

How many hours/week work

8	10-25
6	26-39
27	40-50
5	over 50

Kind of work performed in last job

6	professional
7	clerical
4	sales
0	domestic
11	service
7	machine trade
2	structural worker
1	motor transport
1	other
6	N/A

How many hours worked then

2	10-25
4	26-39
27	40-5-
4	50 or more
1	6 hrs/day (part-time)
1	8 hrs/day (part-time)

What was rate of pay

7	minimum wage
6	$3.50 - 4.50
10	4.00 - 6.00
7	6.01 - 8.00
5	8.01 - 10.00
3	over 10.00

Belonged to union

8	Yes
33	No

How long listed with Service before finding job

7	1 week - 1 month
19	2 - 4 months
6	4 - 6 months
3	6 - 12 months
4	more than twelve months

Employed Respondent willing to:	Previously		Did	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Relocate	17	28	1	39
Enter a training program	37	8	4	36
Work part-time	31	13	9	31
Join a job find club	34	11	0	40
take a different type of job	40	5	15	25
take on-the-job training	42	3	11	29
take a cut in pay	17	55	10	29
take any available job	22	23	9	31

Would register again with Job Service

39	Yes
5	No

Job Service is an effective source of jobs

34	Yes
9	No

Know of other sources of jobs

33	Yes
12	No

Other ways of finding jobs

0	family
4	friends
3	self
5	ads - TV - news
6	other

QUESTIONS FOR CURRENTLY UNEMPLOYED RESPONDENTS

Employer Industry

1	government/public utilities
4	agriculture, forestry, fishing
4	mining
2	construction
11	manufacturing
1	wholesale trade
10	retail trade
1	finance, insurance, real estate
18	services

Type of work - last employer

7	professional, technical, managerial
5	sales
4	machine trades
3	clerical
3	processing
3	benchwork
2	motor freight, transportation
2	package/materials handler
2	domestic
14	other service work
3	other

Hours work - last employer

8	10 - 25
4	26 - 39
31	40 - 50

Pay rate - last employer

13	minimum wage
10	3.50 - 4.00
13	4.01 - 6.00
6	6.01 - 8.00
3	8.01 - 10.00
1	Over 10.00

Belonged to union

7	Yes
40	No

Time With Job Service

16	Over 12 months
12	6 -12 months
10	2 - 4 months
6	4 -6 months

Unemployed Respondent Willing to:	Previously Willing		Now Willing		
	Yes	No	Yes	Unsure	No
Relocate	18	35	21	3	27
enter training program	49	4	46	2	3
work part time	38	15	35	3	12
join job find club	40	12	38	3	8
take different type job	48	5	45	2	4
take on-the-job training	52	1	49	1	2
take a cut in pay	29	20	23	4	14
take any job available	28	25	23	4	24

Will continue to use Job Service

42	Yes
10	No

Know other sources of jobs

41	Yes
13	No

Other sources considered more effective than Job Service

26	Yes
10	No
3	Unsure

Part VI

Job Service Salaries

It goes without saying that salary is a major factor in attracting and keeping talented employees. One factor said to contribute to Job Service morale and motivation problems, as well as serving as a deterrent to recruiting more highly skilled staff, is the salary structure for Job Service employees. In order to assess the accuracy of that belief an attempt has been made to compare the newly revised DET salary schedule with pay plans for similarly qualified employees in other government jurisdictions, and with the pay scales of teachers and principals.

It should be emphasized at the outset that top level DET officials have been very aware of and extremely concerned about the salary lag of their employees. Recognizing this, DET officials proposed to the Legislature and received from it a substantial program of salary increases and the upgrading of Job Service employees across the board. The extensiveness of these increases can be seen by comparing the figures found in the third and fourth columns of Table 3. The salary levels discussed in the text of this section do reflect the new (FY 1986) base salaries for each DET position discussed. For illustrative purposes, we have looked closely at one major suburban county within the state. Where possible, we matched minimum qualifications, the inclusion of supervisory duties where appropriate, the length of time to

reach maximum base salary within a particular category as well as promotional issues and pay raises due to cost of living indexing. Table 3 provides a brief tabular presentation of the results of this investigation, which in turn, is discussed in more detail in the narrative that follows.

The lowest level entry position into Job Service is classified as an "Employment Security Specialist Trainee." The minimum qualifications for this position are either a B.A. degree or a high school diploma or equivalent with one year's experience as an Employment Service (ES) Associate II. The ES trainee level may be considered a paraprofessional or preprofessional level position. Base starting salary for 1985-86 is $14,022. Salary after five years is $17,982. An equivalent position in county government in terms of minimum qualifications and job description is one entitled "Personnel Assistant." In a typical suburban government jurisdiction, the starting salary for this job is about $15,700 with an increase to $19,483 after a five-year period. These two positions, therefore, maintain the same relative salary pace over time, but with the county position paying about $1,500 more. Private employment agency salaries obviously vary. One private agency contacted, however, reported that its entry level position required a BA with no experience and the starting salary was between $16,000-$18,000, depending upon individual qualifications. This agency suggested that such

salaries are considered fairly standard throughout the industry for entry level positions.

The second level of Job Service employee is the Employment Security Specialist I (ES I). At present, the minimum qualifications for this position are one year's experience as an ES trainee or equivalent work in the employment security administration. This, too, is considered an entry level position and similar to that of a county government's Personnel Analyst I (for which a BA is required). The base salary range for an ES I is $15,041 rising to $19,316 after five years. The Personnel Analyst I position begins at $18,612.50 rising to $23,526.04 during the same time period.

DET's Counselor I position is similar in salary structure to the ES I position. For this position, a BA plus three graduate credits in appropriate course work and relevant experience or an MA in an appropriate field is required. The pay scale is similar to the ES I level, $15,000 to $19,000 after five years. In the public schools, a beginning teacher may start at $16,000 rising to $19,000 after five years. A trained counselor, however, usually with an M.A. similar to that required for the Counselor I position, starts (assuming no prior teaching experience) at $17,219.25 and rises to $21,264.17 after the same five-year period, but this is for a 10-month appointment. Private employment agencies report that an entry level equivalent position to the ES I position would require a B.A. + two

years appropriate experience, and that salaries would begin at around $20,000.

The next two higher Job Service position classifications are the Employment Security Specialist II (ES II) and III (ES III). Approximately the same pay scale is also assigned to Employment Service Representatives I and II (ESR I and ESR II). Minimum qualifications for the ES II position are one year as an ES I or equivalent; for an ES III, one year as an ES II or equivalent. The ESR I must have one year as a ES I or a B.A. and two years experience in the field; ESR II's must have one year as an ESR I or a B.A. and three years relevant experience. Starting salaries for these positions are: ES II and ESR I - $16,168 to $21,206 after six years; ES III and ESR II - $17,404 to $22,842 after six years.

Personnel Analyst II, Personnel Technician II, or Personnel Specialist II are comparable positions in local Maryland jurisdictions to the ES II, ES III, ESR I, and ESR II positions. Salaries (based on 1985 figures for similarly qualified persons) vary significantly from a starting salary of $19,837 rising to $23,738 after three years to a starting salary of $25,976 rising to $29,256 after six years. Some government jurisdictions report even higher salaries after six years service. The significance of this variance is even greater than it first appears since, for a majority of Job Service employees, this classification level is the one in

which they are likely to remain for the longest period of time in their career in the Job Service.

Supervisory positions obviously provide far fewer job openings in the Job Service than the previous non-supervisory job classifications that have been discussed. Nevertheless, they are critical to the effective functioning of the Job Service. The lowest supervisory position, an ES IV, has a base salary of $18,736 rising to $24,602 after six years. Minimum qualifications for this position include one year as a ES II or III or as an ESR I. Considered "lead workers," individuals in these positions often may supervise a section of officer workers. A comparable county-level position, a Personnel Analyst II in one jurisdiction examined, required a B.A. plus four years of relevant experience. The starting salary for this position was $27,200 rising to $33,952 after five years. A department chairperson in a school system, a position with similar supervisory duties with a B.A. plus four years experience, for example, would begin at about $20,000 and after five years, to up to a minimum of $25,000 for a 10-month contract.

The initial formally designated Job Service supervisory positions are classified as E.S. Supervisor I and II. Minimum qualifications include a B.A. and four years management experience or an M.A. and three years experience. Salary levels begin at $20,179 (ES Supervisor I) and $21,732 (ES Supervisor II) and rise to $26,502 and $28,552, respec-

tively, after six years. Private agency salaries for individuals with comparable responsibilities are reported to be higher, but no specific figures were available.

Top managerial level positions are somewhat more difficult to compare and assess. DET has designated their office manager classification as Office Manager (OM) I, II and III. Classification of these is determined by the size, workforce, and workload of the local office. OM I's manage the smaller Job Service offices. The base salary level for an OM I is $21,732 and rises to $28,552 after six years. Minimum qualifications include five years experience above trainee and at least one year of supervisory experience. The Office Manager III position has a base salary of $25,227 that rises to $33,135 after six years. A similar position in terms of minimum qualifications and duties in a local jurisdiction in that of Personal Analyst IV. The base salary for this job is $31,057 and it rises to $38,777 after five years. Public school salaries obviously vary greatly, but in one suburban school district, an assistant principal of a high school (M.A. + 10 years experience, for example) begins at $30,000. Principals in a small school would also start at $30,000 while pincipals in large schools might start at $33,000, $8,000 higher than the beginning salary of the manager of a Job Service office who would be responsible for overseeing a comparable number of professionals.

In sum, the leadership of DET is deserving of much praise for its recognition of a major gap in the earnings of Job Service personnel and its success in taking a very significant first step in closing this gap during the past year. Nevertheless, it seems evident that still more needs to be done. While the new base salaries of lower level Job Service employees have been improved, and are now more consistent with similarly qualified employees in other areas, as staff move up the grade and salary scale and into managerial positions, they do begin to lose ground to employees who hold comparable positions in other kinds of organizations.

Table 3

SELECTED BASE SALARIES OF SELECTED EMPLOYMENT SERVICE POSITIONS AND COMPARABLE REPRESENTATIVE JOBS

JOB TITLE	MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS	1984 MIN	1985-1986 MIN	1985-1986 MAX	YRS TO MAX
E.S. Trainee	B.A. or H.S. + 1yr as E.S. Assoc.	12,651	14,022	17,982	5
Personnel Assistant	H.S. + 2 yrs. clerical or technical work	na	15,702	19,843	5
E.S. I	B.A. or H.S. + 1yr. as E.S. trainee	13,482	15,041	19,316	5
Private Agency	B.A. - no experience	na	16,000 - 18,000 start		
Beginning Teacher	B.A.	na	15,989 (10 month salary)	19,036	5
DET Counselor I	B.A. + 3 credits/ 1 yr. as E.S. Tr. + 2 yrs. exp. OR M.A.	13,482	15,041	19,316	5
Private Agency	B.A. + 2 yrs. exp.	na	20,000 - 23,000 start		
Personnel Analyst I	B.A. (+ experience)	na	18,612	23,526	5
E.S II & ESR I	B.A. + 2 yrs. exp.	14,462	16,168	21,206	6
E.S. III	1 yr. E.S.II	15,546	17,404	22,842	6
ESR II	B.A. + 3 yrs. exp.	"	"	"	"
Teacher	B.A. + 2 yrs.	na	17,640	22,071	5
Personnel Analyst II	B.A. + 2 yrs. exp.	na	23,526	29,678	5

Personnel Technician II (gov't)		na	19,837	23,738	3
Anne Arundel gov't equiv.		na	24,082	31,599	11
Howard gov't equiv.		na	21,731	28,501	6
Montgomery gov't equiv.		na	25,976	39,623	22
	(Supervisory positions)				
E.S. IV	1 yr. ESII/III or ESR I	16,734	18,736	24,602	6
Personnel Analyst III (gov't)	B.A. + 4 yrs. exp.	na	27,200	33,952	5
E.S. Supv. I	B.A. + 4 yrs. manag. OR M.A. + 3 yrs. manag.	18,015	20,179	26,502	6
E.S. Superv. II		19,402	21,732	28,552	6
Private agency		28,000 - 35,000 start			
	(Managerial positions)				
Personnel Analyst III	B.A. + 6 yrs. exp. (incl. 2 yrs. supvr.)	na	31,057	38,777	5
Office Manager I	5 yrs. above trainee (1 yr. supervisory)	19,402	21,732	28,552	6
II	6 yrs. above trainee (1 yr. supervisory)	20,896	23,413	30,751	6
III	6 yrs. prof. exp. (2 yrs. supervisory)	22,512	25,227	33,135	6
Principal and Assistant Principals - see Salary descriptive narrative					

Part VII

Job Service Activities in Other Selected Localities

One of the several goals of this research effort was to explore to some modest degree Job Service reform activities going on in other states. The proximity of the research staff to the Washington, D.C. office of the U.S. Department of Labor suggested that it would be a relatively easy task to obtain such information from Federal officials. In fact, that was not the case as the combination of reorganization, decentralization of authority to the states, severe reductions in force and the like had gone a long way to decrease Federal officials' awarness of the msot current policies being pursued by the various states.

As a consequence, brief visits were made to four states. One of the four states, Florida, stood out from the others in that it appeared to be engaged in the most comprehensive of efforts at reforming its Job Service. Thus, in this part of this report, we shall briefly describe various of the activities under way in that state. We shall then turn to a brief examination of the British Job Service which has undergone a major restructuring and revitalization during the past six years. While in Britain on other business, one of the two senior authors of this study was able to spend several days examining the impact of those reform efforts and that is reported on in the second half of this section.

FLORIDA JOB SERVICE

Historically, the Florida State Employment Service was not regarded as an especially progressive one. The past decade has witnessed some major efforts to bring about change in the overall image of the State's employment service. This effort appears to be largely the result of two factors. First, while Florida has historically been a state that has experienced considerable growth, the past ten to twenty years have been a period of very rapid growth, population expansion and economic development. Second, the current governor of Florida, Bob Graham, has, during the course of the seven years in which he has held that office, placed much emphasis upon encouraging the Employment Service to emphasize both coordination with other related organizations and expanded outreach.

In order to obtain a clearer understanding of the manner in which these goals of enhanced coordination and improved outreach had been carried out and implemented at the local level, a series of visits were made to various local Employment Service offices in the metropolitan Tampa area. That city was chosen both because it is roughly comparable to the metropolitan Baltimore area in size and also because its economic base is among the more diversified of cities of that size in the state of Florida with a substantial working- and middle-class population involved in industrial activity. What follows is a description of the most notable character-

istics of the Florida Job Service operation observed in the course of visiting offices and meeting with staff and a discussion of the more unique coordination and outreach activities that take place.

General Operations

The Job Service in Florida is one of several operating divisions of the State's Department of Employment, Training, and Labor. Because of the state's size, both in terms of geography and population, the Employment Service is organized into a number of regions. Each region is headed by a regional administrator and it is to this individual that the heads of the major offices within the region report. Each of the managers of the four major employment service offices in the four county Tampa-St. Petersburg region report to the Region IV manager. In turn, each manager of the major offices is likely to have the heads of two or three satellite offices reporting to him/her.

In most instances, individual employment service offices function independently of other agency offices. This is a relatively new development, in that, until about five or six years ago, most employment service offices were co-located with Unemployment Insurance offices. The movement away from co-location was actually initiated by the Unemployment Insurance division of the department and was done for two reasons: firstly, to facilitate the centralization of UI operation into a single office for ease of operations in each

metropolitan area; and, secondly, in order to eliminate the task of finding increasingly larger office space for the co-located UI and Employment Service offices. In such offices as continued to be co-located, however, the two were maintained as distinct entities, often in separate office space that was located next door to each other.

The local employment service offices that were visited were, in each instance, found to be located in fairly new and spacious facilities. The floors were carpeted, with the quality ranging from acceptable to good. There was enough space between desks to give individuals seeking assistance a sense of at least a modest degree of privacy. The general ambience was far from luxurious, and much of the office furniture showed considerable wear and tear; nevertheless, there was a general aura of neatness, openness, and lightness that made the physical experience of visiting the office an acceptably pleasant activity.

One significant factor contributing to the general pleasantness of the ambiance of these offices was the level of automation which has been implemented in the Florida Employment Service offices. While these offices are not, despite their characterization as such by the office managers, paperless, most paper records have been eliminated. Consequently, one does not see the large number of file cabinets and other makeshift record-holding facilities that one frequently sees in Maryland State Employment Service

offices. The absence of such equipment seems to have a more significant effect than one might expect in making for an attractive environment in the office.

The computerized record-keeping system that is responsible for this absence of file cases has been in effect in Florida Employment Service offices for the last eighteen months. The data taken from clients seeking employment and employers wishing to list jobs is still taken on a printed form which is filled out by an employment service staff member. On the same day that it is taken, however, this data is entered into a statewide computer system that is housed in the state capital, Tallahassee. In order to ensure the accuracy of the data entry process, the paper forms which have been completed are kept on file for one week, and then they are discarded. Each night, the data that is entered into the system is analyzed at the central computer in Tallahassee, and the next morning local offices receive printouts which match and rank individual candidates for available jobs.

The information in the printout includes several items of data about the company and the position that it is seeking to fill, as well as training and work experience records for each of the candidates which the computer has matched with the job. Staff members then review the information provided in the printout, double checking in some cases to ensure the accuracy of the matching which has occurred. They then seek

to contact the individuals whose names have been suggested. In the large majority of cases, the individuals who have been suggested are not readily reachable by telephone and are consequently sent a form letter the same day indicating the availability of the position, and inviting them to contact the local employment service office to obtain more detailed information. This letter also contains the name of the employer.

Extended Outreach

A number of initiatives have been undertaken in the last several years to expand the outreach of the Florida Job Service. Many of these involve activities developed as a consequence of enhanced coordination with other organizations, and, consequently, will be described in the section that follows. Among the most notable of these outreach activities has been the opening of a number of small satellite offices which are operated under the jurisdiction of each of the major local offices. Other activities have involved the undertaking of significant public relations initiatives designed to call greater public attention to the operation of the Job Service.

Certainly, the most significant effort that expanded outreach for the Job Service in Florida has involved is the policy of opening small, neighborhood-based satellite offices. Thus, for example, the mid-town Tampa office of the Job Service, which is roughly equivalent for that city to the

Eutaw Street office of the Maryland State Employment Service, has three satellite offices, with plans underway for a fourth. These satellite offices have from three to ten individuals staffing them. The largest is almost entirely sponsored by the local service delivery area (SDA). Space is provided by the local PIC and the staff members who operate it are funded through a subcontract with the local SDA. Another of the satellite offices operates out of space which has been provided to the Employment Service by local government.

Other forms of outreach have been developed in addition to the satellite offices. For example, each of the city's two large vocational training institutions have had an employment service staff member outposted to them on a permanent basis to provide various Job Service activities. Mechanized outreach, in the form of a client-operated computer terminal, provides both general career information, as well as access to non-employer identified job listings and have been set up in the local university and community college.

The two primary public relations activities that have been engaged in by the Job Service involved Employment Week and the Professional Placement Network. Employment Week is an annual event which is sponsored jointly by the Job Service, the Chamber of Commerce, and the PIC. Employment Week involves the carrying out of a concentrated set of

activities during one single week of the summer designed to attract attention to the Job Service and the services that it provides to individuals. It involves activities ranging from the issuance of a proclamation by the mayor to the carrying out of job fairs, the presentation of public interest television spots, and the provision in the media of public interest stories. The Professional Placement Network is an experimental program in which local job service offices have begun to collect the resumes of professionals seeking employment. Each month a newsletter is sent to 2,000 local businesses which includes condensed sample resumes of these professionals who have registered with the Job Service. These employers are also sent a monthly bulletin which is produced jointly by the Employment Service and the local service delivery area which talks about major developments involving the area, employer needs, and Job Service activities.

A final outreach activity being carried out by the Job Service involved the development of the "account executive" system - a regular employment service staff person who has been given the special task working only on the needs of a specifically designated group of employers who are heavy users of the local Job Service office. These "account executives" become familiar with each of the companies for whom they have responsibility and, as a result, are better able to assist these companies in finding employment service

clients to meet exactly the specific skill needs of the company in question.

Coordination Activities

Each of the Job Service offices visited engaged in fairly extensive networking of coordinated activities with other local public and private organizations. These activities resulted in joint program efforts with the State Corrections Department, local governments, local aging agency, and the American Association of Retired People. The primary focus of the coordination activities carried out by these employment service offices, however, was the local service delivery area and PIC. These efforts took a variety of forms ranging from collaborative planning efforts and regular meetings, to formal contractual arrangements. Planning activities focused primarily around the development of the annual plan that is produced by each local Job Service office. While the plan is an internally developed document, considerable consultation with PIC members and SDA staff occurs in its preparation. In addition, it is required that, before the plan is submitted by the local office to the regional administrator, it must be signed off by the major of the city as well as several PIC members. One page of the plan is specifically designated as a place where the comments, suggestions, and criticisms of the individuals who have signed off are to be included as the plan is sent forward to the regional and state administrators. In

addition to that, coordination takes place throughout the planning process, and there is, at a minimum, a monthly meeting between the heads of the regions' SDAs and the employment service regional administrator.

Each local Job Service office seems to be involved in a number of coordinative activities which have resulted in their having on site additional staff who are funded by other organizations. In a Job Service office in an area where there is a high concentration of senior citizens, for example, there is one half-time staff member funded by the American Association of Retired Persons, and another half-time staff member funded by the County Aging Office who are specialists in the employment needs of senior citizens. As has been noted above, the largest satellite office of Tampa Employment Service office is co-located in the offices of the Tampa PIC in downtown Tampa, and is staffed by ten individuals who are funded out of a contract between the PIC and the Employment Service. In addition to providing local employment service activities in that particular office, these individuals also have the responsibility for developing all the on-the-job training activities that are undertaken by the Tampa SDA. Other staff in local government service offices are funded through the WIN program to provide services to AFDC recipients and by the state correction agency to provide services to parolees.

GREAT BRITAIN

The services that are provided for jointly by the U.S. Department of Labor and individual state employment and training agencies in cooperation with local service delivery areas are, in Great Britain, administered by the Manpower Services Commission (MSC). The MSC was created in Great Britain about eight years ago as part of an effort to reform the administration of the nation's employment and labor services by lessening somewhat Civil Service control and bringing a greater degree of private sector involvement into the shaping of policy for these services. This was accomplished by transferring responsibility for the agency that provides and manages such services from a cabinet secretary to a commission composed of high ranking, private sector business figures. Thus, while still maintained as a government program administered by government employees, the MSC provided a vehicle for having a high degree of private sector involvement in the shaping of the broad policies which the government pursued in areas of employment, training, unemployment insurance, and the like.

The employment service, as it operated in great Britain prior to the establishment of the MSC, looked remarkably like the employment service as it currently operates in the State of Maryland. This was especially true in terms of the physical appearance of the employment service. Most employment service offices in the United Kingdom were co-located

with the Unemployment Insurance offices, most often being housed in old and dreary looking facilities. Moreover, the employment service function was frequently dominated by the Unemployment Insurance activity. Consequently, many Britons looked upon the country's employment service as simply an organization with which you had to deal while you were receiving your unemployment checks.

In order to improve the image of the employment service, the MSC undertook a number of actions. The first of these was physically to separate the unemployment insurance offices from the employment service offices. As this was being carried out, the unemployment insurance offices were being centralized so that even large cities would generally have only a single unemployment insurance office. At the same time, the employment service offices were being greatly decentralized. Thus, for example, in the case of the nation's largest city, London, where there had been a half dozen employment service offices, the number of offices was expanded to nearly 40. At the same time that the number of offices were being expanded significantly, the actual fucntions to be carried out in these individual offices were, in fact, reduced. Two major areas in which the activities of the local employment service offices were reduced involved first the function of taking job orders and second, the distribution of information to clients about new job orders. The latter was dealt with by structuring the employment

service functions in such a way that all job orders would be placed at one of two central locations within the city of London.

In so far as its Job Service activities, the Manpower Services Commission followed two complimentary strategies. First, it decided to move to the simplest form of labor exchange services, and second, it committed itself to upgrading dramatically the number and quality of offices available to potential clients. The former was done by eliminating the prior requirement that information about clients be recorded and kept on file for subsequent matching of individuals and jobs. As conceived and implemented by the MSC, the new Job Service offices would be simply places where individuals who were seeking jobs came to find out information about those jobs. No longer would the staff at the Employment Service seek out individuals to fill jobs.

The second policy change involved the vast expansion of the number of Job Service offices along with the coincident significant reduction in the size of the staff stationed at these offices and the equally significant upgrading of the quality of the facilities. A lively, uniform color scheme was adopted for all offices, modern furniture acquired, and central main street office locations were chosen.

Part VIII

Organization and Policy Recommendations for the Maryland State Job Service

Writing the recommendations section for a report of this sort is, in a sense, a very pleasant experience for external consultants. Unlike agency administrators, external consultants are not bound by State personnel systems, extant leases, and tight budgets. Rather, external consultants can be guided by their own personal vision of what represents the best of all possible arrangements. Nevertheless, regardless of how good the recommendations, the Maryland Job Service cannot be taken apart and put back together again in such a way as to make everything possible all at once.

The result of this is that some of the recommendations made here are much more likely to be rapidly implemented than others. In part, this is because some recommendations involve program changes that everyone agrees are needed immediately. In other cases, recommendations will require a long time and much effort to implement, In some instances, events over which agency heads and program managers have no control will either make change inevitable or preclude rapid movement in one or another direction.

The difficulty and complexity of implementing the recommendations of a study of this type are readily evident by looking at the results of a similar effort that took place almost twenty years ago at the Federal level. In 1966, the

current Secretary of State George C. Schultz, then the Dean of the Graduate School of Business at the University of Chicago, chaired a U.S. Department of Labor Advisory Panel on the future of the Employment Service. The first two recommendations of this study represent quite different and, in a sense, almost typical cases in point insofar as success in implementation. The first recommendation has been partially implemented through various means. The second Schultz recommendation was not implemented in Maryland and certainly bears a striking resemblance to the first recommendation of this report. The two recommendations were:

> Recommendation 1. The mission of the Service should be clarified by revision of the Wagner-Peyser Act to emphasize its role as a comprehensive manpower service agency rather than just a labor exchange.
>
> Recommendation 2. Separate the Employment Service from the Unemployment Insurance Service at all levels as a means of strengthening administration; remove the stigma of "the unemployment office;" and establish the Service as an agency with a positive mission.

We are aware that some of the recommendations which follow may be a bit controversial; others less so. In each case, however, they represent the best judgment of the research staff. We are also aware that the Department of Employment and Training has already begun to implement several of the recommendations that follow. In certain instances, the Department had begun to do so simultaneously with the commissioning of this study. In others, the need

to take action became evident as the study progressed. We vigorously applaud the Department for the actions that it has already taken, and encourage them to consider the implementation of all of the proposals which follow.

1. Separate the Job Service from UI Operations. In order to give the Job Service greater visibility and a more positive image in the eyes of employers, the agency should be administered separately from the Unemployment Insurance Program. This separation should be both physical (separate offices) and organizational (separate line of command).

2. Break up large centralized offices. As rapidly as possible, the large offices, especially those found in the Baltimore metropolitan area, should be replaced by several smaller, more conveniently located and more personalized offices. These offices should be located where they are more easily accessible to employers and job seekers alike. The optimal locations will be in the heart of the community that the office is designed to serve, in a highly visible location, and readily accessible to both walk-in and drive-in traffic.

3. Improve office decor. This should be done by installing modern office furniture (especially in areas of client and employer contact), regularly painting offices in non-institutional colors, and the carrying out of any other steps

necessary to make offices more attractive to employers and applicants.

4. Prioritize agency missions and align staffing accordingly. The missions of the Job Service should be stated clearly and in priority order, with the labor exchange function as the top priority. Staffing should correspond to this prioritization.

5. Develop improved and upgraded career ladders, with salaries commensurate with other state jobs. The Job Service loses many able employees who begin their careers in State service with it and then find that opportunities for advancement within it are not readily evident.

6. Continue to upgrade training. This should be an especially high priority for interviewers and counselors. Require all new interviewers and counselors to attend training within six months of being hired, with regularly-scheduled retraining required in subsequent years.

7. Assign employer representatives to specific industries or employers. Train Employer Representatives in marketing techniques and have them learn in depth the skill needs of the employers to whom they are assigned.

8. Develop a system of planning that originates at the level of the individual offices.

9. Provide more clerical support with automated functions.

10. Run offices by appointment. Handle "walk-ins" to the extent that it is feasible to do so with immediate assessment of job-ready status and assign to a subsequent appointment time.

11. Post local openings on job board for clients to see. An attractive job board can serve as a useful focus of interest and attention for job seekers as well as providing an important source of information and learning about job opportunities.

12. Take steps to personalize service to clients. Use names, not numbers, or both but never numbers alone.

13. Require all jobs to be posted in job bank within two hours of receipt.

14. Continue to implement and expand automated Job Search.

15. Provide bi-annual training in DOT coding for those required to use it.

16. Follow-up on placements one month later to determine whether client is working out. Record and analyze results of follow-ups to provide information on where improvements are needed. This follow-up could be made the responsibility of the Employment Reps.

17. Applicants not placed should be contacted periodically to determine their status. Those who have found jobs should be removed from the applicant rolls.

18. Divide the caseload of each office among staff, rather than have each staff person working with the entire applicant caseload. This division of labor could be along occupational lines.

19. Require an Associate of Arts degree as the minimum educational requirement for the position of E.S. Interviewer.

20. Develop a more uniform and lively color scheme for Job Service office decor.

21. Develop a series of brochures that are visually lively and simply written that provide tips on job seeking and describe the services provided by the Job Service. A separate series should be developed for applicants and employers.

22. Job Service staff should become more diversified and able to assume any duties in the office as workload demands. This would mean that all staff would be versed in some minimal vocational counseling techniques.

23. Require that Job Service check work histories and references for applicants before recommending them for referral.

24. Allow State offices to use Job Service for hiring of new staff members. This might be accomplished by mandating a specified period of time for use of prior merit listings, after which jobs become "public domain" and available for referral through Job Service.

25. Utilize Unemployment Insurance mailings for the purposes of disseminating information about and publicizing the Maryland Job Service. Currently, the Department of Employment and Training sends quarterly mailings to each of the State's employers to notify them of their Unemployment Insurance tax bill. Such mailings could serve as a very useful vehicle for the dissemination of information about the Job Service.

26. Increase the level of professional training for all individuals holding counselor positions. Currently, there appears to be much variation in the level of background and professional training possessed by individuals who hold counselor-type positions in the Employment Service. Numerous people in these positions have moved up through experience gained at lower level positions. In a number of cases it appears that these individuals had never received formal training in areas like test administration, interpretation, vocational counseling and the like. The Department should make a special effort to provide both an in-service training program for individuals currently in these positions and to

ensure that staff who subsequently moved into these positions have had the appropriate prior professional training.

27. Stricter standards of selection should be enforced in appointing people to the position of Employment Service Specialist. Currently, it appears that virtually all individuals who have served as Employment Service Trainees for up to three years are automatically promoted to the position of Employment Service Specialist. Effective interviewing requires interpersonal skills, which not all people may possess. An effective interviewer can facilitate working with a client in the same way that an effective one can greatly complicate the process of meeting the clients' needs.

28. Several of the manuals which describe data entry and report compilation should be rewritten in such a fashion as to make them less complex and difficult to read. Ease of use of these manuals, and the consequent recording of data, could be greatly improved by providing both more detail and presenting the information in a clearer fashion.

29. Steps need to be taken to increase the clarity of communication about Job Service activity. There are many highly specialized, and sometimes quite obscure, terms, concepts and acronyms that are used by various of the staff of the Job Service. This can make it very difficult for both employers and job seekers as well as new staff members at the

Job Service. The development of a lexicon of Job Service terminology, as well as a brief descriptive overview of its activities would be a useful step in dealing with this problem.

30. Continue current efforts to improve the salaries of Job Service employees, especially those in managerial level positions. The Department has taken a significant step in this direction with its most recent pay raises, but there is still improvement needed in order to make Job Service salaries competitive with those of comparable jobs with comparable responsibilities. This is especially true in the area of managerial level positions.

Appendix A

Use of Private Employment Agencies by AFDC/WIN Programs

Use of Private Employment Agencies By AFDC/WIN Programs

The 1983 amendments to the Wagner-Peyser specifically removed the prohibition on the use of private employment agencies for the placement of registrants at public employment services. As of yet, no state has entered into a formal arrangement with private employment agencies to provide assistance in the placement of employment service registrants. Maryland is currently considering entering into such an arrangement and, as a consequence, research staff undertook brief efforts to determine if there were any extant programs that might provide analagous information about the way in which such an arrangement might work.

Presently, two states, Pennsylvania and Texas, are using private employment agencies to some extent to find employment opportunities for welfare recipients. Both of these efforts are WIN demonstrations operated by the State Welfare departments. These programs are generally similar, with the most significant similarity being that both programs use a voucher system to pay for persons placed in employment.

Pennsylvania

In Pennsylvania, payment is made to either private agencies (by voucher) or to the state employment agency (by contract for a fixed amount) for the placement of welfare recipients in jobs. The Pennsylvania Department of Public

Welfare's program of paying private employment agencies to place welfare recipients in paid employment began in 1979, and now is funded annually at the level of $1 million. The program, called the "Private Employment Agency Voucher Program," is somewhat controversial, and there appears to be some significant administrative problems in the program management. The program began initially as a way to get General Assistance (GA) recipients off the welfare rolls and into paid employment, and the $1 million was all from State funds. It is now all or partially considered a WIN demonstration project, so some of the funds, possibly up to 90% are now Federal. The program, while initially for state General Assistance recipients, now is also for AFDC recipients.

Welfare applicants, at the time of application, are immediately referred to the state employment service (Office of Employment Security, OES), which is given 15 days to find the person employment. If OES does not place the person within 15 days, the person is referred back to the welfare department for either direct placement, or given a voucher to use at a private employment agency. OES may, at the same time, continue to seek employment for this person, but they no longer have the sole rights to secure a placement.

The voucher to the private agency is good for 30 days. The limit is necessary as the Department has limited funds

(i.e., $1 million statewide) for this program and cannot have unlimited vouchers outstanding. The program, while statewide, makes the greatest number of placements in Philadelphia and Allegheny counties. At the beginning of the program, there was a placement success rate of 56%. The success rate has risen to 67% for the PEP program. Success is defined as a job lasting at least 10 consecutive weeks. The Federal GAO is presently conducting an audit of the program in Pittsburgh. It has been unofficially reported that it is reputed to have found that about 70% to 80% of the private employment agency placements are not in the placement pool of the state job service. This is seen by the Department of Public Welfare as a significant finding which shows that there is not duplication of effort in using the private agencies.

There were approximately 2000 placements through the private employment agencies in Pennsylvania in FY '85. The payment to the private agencies is made on a case by case basis and the job must be for 30 or more hours per week. There is some debate now within the welfare department on how to set the fee schedule for the private agencies. It is currently at a flat rate, although only a percentage is paid if the person works less than 10 consecutive weeks. Only a small percentage of the employment agencies in the state make 10 or more placements in a year. The percentage now is 10% of gross actually earned to date if the person quits in less

than 10 weeks. If the person works 10 consecutive weeks, the private agency receives $1000. State welfare administrators feel that there has been some abuse by private agencies and the rules have been changed to guard against them. One program administrator with experience with the program commented that it does have a legitimate role in the placement of welfare clients, but that it needs to be closely monitored and administered.

Texas

The Texas program is smaller than than in Pennsylvania. Unlike Pennsylvania, clients are not sent first to the State Employment Service and applicants do not have concurrent listings with more than one placement source. Applicants are listed either with the welfare department, a private employment agency, or with the State Employment Service. The amount of the voucher, as in Pennsylvania, is dependent upon how long the placement lasts, but the amount is computed in a different fashion. Private agencies receive $100 for the placement, and $4.50 each day that the person remains employed, up to 90 days or a maximum of $550.

Program Constraints

There are two constraints which limit the activities of these programs. First, both the Texas and Pennsylvania programs operate with fixed sums of money, which limits the number of placements that can be made. Second, there is the

issue of who will pay for the placement. The kinds of placements that are likely to be made through these programs are those called APF (Applicant Pays Fee). Most jobs are in the category EPF (Employer Pays Fee). According to the amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act, private employment agencies can by reimbursed for placement of clients by government funds only if the client is not charged a fee.

Appendix B

Sample of Employer Questionnaire

CODE # _____

Date _____

EMPLOYER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Is this company part of a larger organization? _____YES _____NO
   If yes, what organization and where is its home office located?

   _____

2. Please (CIRCLE BELOW) the industry type which best identifies your company's primary business interests:

   AGRICULTURE, FISHING, FORESTRY
   MINING
   CONSTRUCTION
   MANUFACTURING
   TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATIONS, UTILITIES
   WHOLESALE TRADE
   RETAIL TRADE
   FINANCE, INSURANCE, REAL ESTATE
   SERVICES
   GOVERNMENT/PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

3. Approximately how long has your company been at this location?

   _____

4. What is the approximate size of the total workforce (including managers, administrators, etc.) located at this facility? _____

5. What is the approximate percentage of employees who are classified as

	0%	0-25	25-50	50-75	75-100
PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL, MANAGERIAL	____	____	____	____	____
CLERICAL	____	____	____	____	____
SKILLED	____	____	____	____	____
SEMI-SKILLED	____	____	____	____	____
UNSKILLED	____	____	____	____	____

   OTHER (SPECIFY) _____

6. Do you anticipate that your company will be changing its number of employees at this site during the next year?

   _____YES _____NO _____DON'T KNOW

7. Has the number of employees at your company changed significantly within the last year?

   _____YES _____NO _____DON'T KNOW

8. If the answer to questions 6 or 7 was yes, please indicate briefly the reasons for, extent of, and likely duration of the changes.

   _____

   _____

   _____

9. Which Job Service office would your company be most likely to use to list vacancies?

_____ /Don't Know

(CIRCLE DON'T KNOW IF APPROPRIATE)

10. Would you find it useful if there was a job service office located closer to your company?

_____YES _____NO _____DON'T KNOW

11. Has your company listed vancancies with the Maryland State Employment Service (Job Service/Job Bank) within the last two (2) years?

_____YES _____NO _____DON'T KNOW

If NO: Why not? _____

_____

_____

If YES:

A. Please indicate the approximate number of the following job types that you have listed with the State Employment Service (Job Service/Job Bank) during the past two years:

PROFESSIONAL, ETC.	_____	PROCESSING	_____
CLERICAL	_____	MACHINE TRADES	_____
SALES	_____	BENCHWORK	_____
DOMESTIC	_____	STRUCTURAL WORKER	_____
OTHER SERVICE	_____	TRANSPORTATION	_____
FARM, FORESTRY	_____	MATERIALS HANDLER	_____

OTHER (SPECIFY) _____

B. Of those vancancies that your company listed with the job service, what salary level would you say was most common?

MINIMUM WAGE	_____	$6.00 - $8.00	_____
$3.50 - $4.00	_____	$8.00 - $10.00	_____
$4.50 - $5.50	_____	$10.00 & ABOVE	_____
		DON'T KNOW	_____

C. How often would you say that your company has used the Job Service to help fill vacant positions?

_____ ONCE A YEAR
_____ 2 - 10 TIMES A YEAR
_____ AT LEAST ONCE A MONTH
_____ MORE FREQUENTLY THAN ONCE A MONTH

D. Is your company's use of the Job Service:

_____ EVENLY SPACED THROUGHOUT THE YEAR
_____ SPORADIC WITH NO PARTICULAR PATTERN
_____ SEASONALLY DETERMINED
_____ DETERMINED BY CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENTS

E. When your company representative contracted the Job Service office, was he/she able to place the job order promptly?

_____YES _____NO _____DON'T KNOW

F. When your company called the Job Service office, was your representative able to speak with the same individual each time?

_____YES _____NO _____DON'T KNOW

G. Would it be helpful to you if your company was able to speak to the same individual each time?

_____YES _____NO _____DON'T KNOW

H. Why did you use the Job Service to list vacancies in your company? _____

_____

_____

_____

I. was the Job Service office able to help you fill your vacancies?

_____YES _____NO _____DON'T KNOW

J. Did your company adivise the Job Service of hires from referrals from the local Job Service office?

_____YES _____NO _____DON'T KNOW

K. Are you planning to use the Job Service again within the next year?

_____YES _____NO _____DON'T KNOW

IF NO: Why not? _____

_____

_____

L. Which occupations would your company be most willing to list with the Job Service office? _____

_____

Why? _____

_____

_____

_____

M. Which occupations would your company absolutely not be willing to list with the Job Service? _____

_____

Why? _____

_____

_____

_____

12. The Maryland State Employment Service provides a variety of services designed to assist the employer. Please indicate on the following list: a) those activities you know about; b) those activities you have actually used or requested; c) those your company has found useful and effective for your purposes; and d) those your company has not found to be effective.

	a) HAVE KNOWLEDGE	b) HAVE USED	c) ARE EFFECTIVE	d) NOT EFFECTIVE
PLACEMENT ACTIVITIES ONLY	_____	_____	_____	_____
TESTING (VOCATIONAL APTITUDE)	_____	_____	_____	_____
JOB DEVELOPMENT	_____	_____	_____	_____
ON-SITE PLACEMENT	_____	_____	_____	_____
JOB OFFICE PLACEMENT	_____	_____	_____	_____
JOB FIND CLUB	_____	_____	_____	_____
TARGETED JOBS TAX CREDIT (TJTC)	_____	_____	_____	_____
TRAINING				
ON-THE-JOB (OJT)	_____	_____	_____	_____
EMERGENCY VETERANS (EVJTA)	_____	_____	_____	_____
OTHER TRAINING	_____	_____	_____	_____
JSEC COMMITTEE	_____	_____	_____	_____
COUNSELING	_____	_____	_____	_____
OTHER (SPECIFY)_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

13. In general, would you rate the Maryland State Employment Service as being (Circle One):
VERY EFFECTIVE EFFECTIVE ADEQUATE INADEQUATE DON'T KNOW

14. Please indicate what your company considers disappointing in its use of the State Employment Servi

_____

_____

_____

15. Please indicate what your company considers plusses in its use of the State Employment Service.

_____

_____

_____

16. What suggestions would your company make to the State Employment Service that would make it more attractive for employers to utilize its service?_____

_____

_____

_____

17. Do you think it would be advisable to physically separate the Job Service office from the Unemployment Insurance office? _____YES _____NO _____DON'T KNOW

18. Is your company a member of the local Job Service Employer Committee (JSEC)?
_____YES _____NO _____NEVER HEARD OF IT _____DON'T KNOW

19. Is your company a member of the area Private Industry Council (PIC)?
_____YES _____NO _____NEVER HEARD OF IT _____DON' KNOW

20. Has your company been involved in any training programs initiated under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) programs?

_____YES _____NO _____NEVER HEARD OF IT _____DON'T KNOW

21. Using the following scale, please rate the following training activities as to their effectiveness based on your company's experience.

1. DON'T KNOW
2. POOR
3. ADEQUATE
4. EFFECTIVE
5. VERY EFFECTIVE

____TRAINING ACTIVITIES THROUGH JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT (JTPA)

____VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

____GOVERNMENT FUNDING OF ON-THE-JOB TRAINING OF NEW EMPLOYEES

____COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRAINING (OTHER THAN THROUGH JTPA)

____TRAINING UNDER FORMER CETA ACTIVITIES

____PRIVATE TRAINING SCHOOLS

____TRAINING PROVIDED BY YOUR OWN COMPANY FOR CURRENT EMPLOYEES

____OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)_____

23. Do you feel there is a need for expanded public sector training activities?

_____YES _____NO _____MAYBE _____DON'T KNOW

24. Which, if any, of the training activities listed in question 22 would you like to see expanded and why?_____

_____

_____

25. Which of the following groups do you believe can benefit from expanded public sector training activities? (CHECK ALL APPLICABLE CATEGORIES)

____CURRENT EMPLOYEES OF YOUR COMPANY

____NEW EMPLOYEES OF YOUR COMPANY

____LAID OFF EMPLOYEES FROM YOUR OWN COMPANY

____LAID OFF EMPLOYEES FROM OTHER COMPANIES (RELATED INDUSTRY)

____LAID OFF EMPLOYEES FROM OTHER COMPANIES (UNRELATED INDUSTRY)

____DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS

____YOUTH

26. What would you recommend to other employers about using the Maryland State Employment Service?

____RECOMMEND WITHOUT RESERVATION

____RECOMMEND

____RECOMMEND WITH RESERVATION

____WOULD NOT RECOMMEND

Please explain your choice:_____

_____

_____

27. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions concerning things that can be done to improve the services that the Maryland State Employment Service provides to employers and job seekers?

_____

_____

_____

_____

28. How would you rate the business climate in the State of Maryland? (Circle One)

EXCELLENT GOOD FAIR POOR DON'T KNOW

29. Do you have any additional comments concerning things that the Department of Employment and Train might do to improve the business climate in the State of Maryland?

_____

_____

_____

_____

30. Do you have any additional comments concerning things that the State of Maryland might do to improve the business climate in this state?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your assistance. The following information is optional.
Title or Position of person answering the questionnaire: _____

_____

Name of Company _____

Company Address _____

_____

_____

Please Return to: Dr. Allen Rosenbaum
MIPAR
University of Maryland Baltimore County
Catonsville, MD 21228

☐ Please check here if you wish a copy of the final report.

Appendix C

Sample of Client Questionnaire

CLIENT IDENTIFICATION NO._____

TIME BEGUN:_____ DATF_____

1. How did you hear about the State Employment Service or the Job Service? Was it from (may say "yes" to more than 1 choice):
   1. friends
   2. unemployment insurance personnel
   3. family members
   4. employer
   5. knew about it
   6. advertisements
   7. didn't know

2. Why did you register with the Job Service? Was it because (READ CHOICES)
   1. it was required by unemployment insurance personnel
   2. it was recommended by someone
   3. it was free
   4. you wanted to use a special program of the Job Service such as counseling, veterans placement, or testing
   5. your wife or husband told you to go there
   6. it was recommended by your last employer
   7. other (specify)
   8. don't know/can't remember

3. How long had you been unemployed before you registered with the Job Service? _____
   1. 1-2 weeks
   2. 3-4 weeks
   3. 5-6 weeks
   4. 6-8 weeks
   5. over 8 weeks
   6. 3-4 months
   7. 4-6 months
   8. over 6 months
   9. don't know/not sure
   10. don't remember

4. Did you register before your unemployment insurance benefits ran out?

   1. yes
   2. no
   3. don't know
   4. not applicable

5. How long have you been registered with the Job Service?

   1. 2-4 weeks
   2. 4-6 weeks
   3. 6-8 weeks
   4. 2-4 months
   5. 4-6 months
   6. over 6 months
   7. don't know/not sure

We are interested in how you were treated at the Job Service office you went to, and the way you were able to make use of the services of the Employment office.

7. Were you seen promptly when you went to the Job Service office?

   1. yes (IF YES: GO TO #9)
   2. no (IF NOT: CONTINUE)
   3. don't remember

8. How long did you have to wait?

   1. 20-30 minutes
   2. 30-60 minutes
   3. 1-2 hours
   4. over 2 hours
   5. don't remember

9. Were there a lot of people waiting to see interviewers at the Job Service office when you went?

   1. yes
   2. no
   3. don't remember

10. About how many would you say there were--at least the first time?_____

11. How often did you go to the Job Service office in the last 9 months?

   1. once
   2. twice
   3. 3-4 times
   4. 5 or more times
   5. not sure/don't remember

12. If you didn't go in again after the first time, did you call the office to ask about jobs after you had registered?

   1. yes (IF YES: CONTINUE)
   2. no (IF NO: GO TO #14)
   3. don't remember

13. About how often do you remember calling?

   1. once (IF ANSWER TO 13 IS "ONCE" OR "TWICE" THEN CONTINUE)
   2. twice
   3. 3-4 times (IF ANSWER TO 13 IS OTHER THAN "1" OR "2" THEN GO TO 15)
   4. over 4 times
   5. don't know
   6. not applicable (GO TO 15)
   7. no answer (GO TO 15)

14. Why didn't you go in again or call again?

15. Were you given referrals by the Job Service to go for interviews or to come to the Job Service office for interviews? (fill out applications)

1. yes (IF YES CONTINUE)
2. no (IF NO: SKIP TO # 21)

16. How many times did the Job Service send you on interviews during the last year?

1. once
2. twice
3. 3-4 times
4. 5-6 times
5. over 6 times
6. Don't remember
7. skip

17. Were these interviews for jobs you would have liked to have had? Explain.

1. yes
2. no
3. don't remember
4. skip

18. Were these interviews for jobs which seemed appropriate for you? Explain.

1. yes
2. no
3. don't remember
4. skip

19. How many of these interview referrals did you actually go to? _____
(IF ANSWER IS DON'T KNOW USE THE # 99)

20. How many of these interviews were held at the Job Service office itself? _____
(IF THE ANSWER IS DON'T KNOW USE THE #99)

21. What type of job were you looking for when you registered with the Job Service?

_____

I am going to read a list of job types. Tell me which of these it is. (READ TITLE)

1. professional, technical, managerial
2. clerical
3. sales
4. domestic
5. other service worker
6. farm, forestry, fishery
7. processing
8. machine trades
9. benchwork
10. structural worker
11. motor, freight, transportation
12. package, materials handler
13. other (specify if can)
14. any

22. Was the job you were looking for the same type as the job you had before you became unemployed?

1. yes (IF YES: GO TO # 26)
2. no (IF NO: CONTINUE)
3. both (CLIFNT COULD WANT BOTH NEW TYPE OR OLD TYPE JOB - CONTINUE)

23. What was the last job you had before coming to the Job Service? (READ LIST FROM #21)

_____

24. Why did you register for a different type of job?_____

_____

25. Had you had any specific training that will help you perform this different job?

1. yes (REMEMBER TRAINING PROGRAM QUESTIONS AT END OF QUESTIONNAIRE)
2. no

26. Did you register for any types of jobs in addition to the one you had had before, or other than your first choice?

1. yes (IF YES GO TO #27 and #28)
2. no (IF NO: GO TO #29)

27. What were your other job choices? (READ LIST FROM #21)

_____

28. Had you had any training in any of these other job types?

1. yes (IF YES: GO TO # AND THEN RETURN TO #29)
2. no

29. When you talked with an interviewer at the Job Service office, what kinds of jobs did the Service have to offer to you? Did they seem to be:

1. mostly professional and managerial
2. mostly clerical
3. mostly sales
4. mostly domestic
5. mostly service worker
6. mostly farm, forestry or fishery
7. mostly processing
8. mostly machine trades
9. mostly benchwork
10. mostly structural worker
11. mostly motor, freight, transportation
12. mostly package, materials handler
13. mostly other types (specify if can)
14. shown only what I asked for

30. What were the salaries like for the jobs that the Service had or offered to you? Were they:

1. minimum wage jobs (3.65/hr)
2. around $4 to $5/hour
3. around $6 to $8/hour
4. more than $8/hour
5. don't know
6. varied
7. not applicable/no jobs offered

31. Was this wage, _____(USE ABOVE ANSWER IN BLANK) acceptable to you?

1. yes
2. no

32. Why do you think that employers list jobs with the Job Service:

_____

(IF THE RESPONSE IS"DON'T KNOW" THEN ASK:)

Do you think that employers list jobs with the Job Service

1. Only when they are minimum wage jobs
2. Only when they must because of the law
3. Only when they can't find anybody any other way
4. Only when the company doesn't have a personnel office
5. Only when the company has a non-union job to offer
6. Only when it is a low level, entry job
7. Other (specify)

33. How do you think that the Job Service could get employers to list more jobs with the Job Service? (open ended response)_____

_____

34. Did your former employer use the Job Service to list openings at the company?

1. yes
2. no
3. don't know

35. Did the people at the Job Service office tell you about other services that they had to help you locate a job? I am going to read you a list of different services that the Job Service has and I want you to tell me if they were mentioned to you.

	YES	NO	DON'T REMEMBER
1. vocational counseling	____	____	____
2. vocational testing	____	____	____
3. training programs *	____	____	____
4. Job Finders Club	____	____	____
5. job location assistance	____	____	____
6. relocation assistance	____	____	____
7. veterans program	____	____	____
8. National Job Bank/interstate	____	____	____
9. job service listings (microfiche)	____	____	____
10. employer recruitment days	____	____	____

(IF YES TO "C" THEN ASK QUESTIONS ABOUT TRAINING PROGRAMS AT END OF QUESTIONNAIRE)

36. Have you used the Job Service for any services other than to register for Placement? I will read you a list of the services that they can give you and would like for you to tell me if you used them, did not use them, and if you used it, was it a helpful service to you.

	USED	DID NOT USE	EFFECTIVE
1. vocational counseling	____	____	____
2. vocational testing	____	____	____
3. training programs	____	____	____
4. Job Finders Club	____	____	____
5. job location assistance	____	____	____
6. relocation assistance	____	____	____
7. veterans programs	____	____	____
8. National Job Bank/interstate	____	____	____
9. Job Service listings/microfiche	____	____	____
10. employer recruitment days	____	____	____

37. I would like to read you a list of personal characteristics that can be used to describe people. I would like to know if the people you talked with at the Job Service office did or did not have these characteristics.

	DID	DID NOT
1. friendly	____	____
2. angry	____	____
3. helpful	____	____
4. cold	____	____
5. interested in you	____	____
6. bored	____	____
7. able to answer questions	____	____
8. well-mannered	____	____

38. Did the people you talked with appear to be what you would call a "competent professional", someone who knew his job and did it well?

1. yes
2. no
3. some yes, some no
4. no opinion

39. How would you rate the Job Service in its ability to find you a job? (ON A SCALE FROM 1 TO 5 WITH 5 AS HIGH ABILITY) _____

40. When you first went to (were referred to) the Job Service, how likely did you think it was that they would help you find a job?

5	4	3	2	1
very	sort of	not at all sure no opinion	probably unlikely	very unlikely

41. Would you refer someone with your employment background, or with your kind of education and skills to the Job Service?

    1. yes
    2. no
    3. with reservations

42. Are you now employed?

    1. yes (IF YES: CONTINUE)
    2. no (IF NO: SKIP TO #61)

(EMPLOYED SECTION)

43. How long have you worked at this job? _____

44. Where do you work? _____(name of employer)

45. What kind of business or industry is this employer involved in? (I mean, what do they make or do there) _____

    1. agriculture, forestry, fishing
    2. mining
    3. construction
    4. manufacturing
    5. transportation, communications, utilities
    6. wholesale trade
    7. retail trade
    8. finance, insurance, real estate
    9. services
    10. government/public administration

46. What kind of work do you do there? _____

    (CLASSIFY ACCORDING TO CATEGORIES LISTED IN #21)

47. How many hours do you work there normally?_____Is this per week, month?

48. What type of work did you do in your last job?_____

(CODE AS IN QUESTION 21-ASK FOR CLARIFICATION OF NOT SURE)

49. Who was your previous employer?_____

50. How many hours did you work normally then?_____per day/week/month(CIRCLE)

51. What was your rate of pay?_____per hour/day/week/biweekly (CIRCLE)

52. Did you belong to a union then?

1. yes
2. no

53. Did you locate your present job through the Job Service?

1. yes
2. no

54. How long would you say you had been listed with the Job Service before you found a job?_____

55. When you first registered with the Job Service, were you willing to:

	YES	NO
1. relocate your home	____	____
2. enter a training program	____	____
3. work part-time	____	____
4. join a job find club	____	____
5. take a different type of job	____	____
6. take on-the-job training	____	____
7. take a cut in pay	____	____
8. take any available job	____	____

56. Did you, in fact, in order to take the job you now have

	YES	NO
1. relocate your home	____	____
2. enter a training program	____	____
3. work part-time	____	____
4. join a job find club	____	____
5. take a different type of job	____	____
6. take on-the-job training	____	____
7. take a cut in pay	____	____
8. take any available job	____	____

57. If you were to find yourself unemployed again, would you register with the Job Service again? Why or why not? _____

1. yes
2. no

58. Is the Job Service an effective source of job possibilities?

1. yes
2. no

59. Are there other sources you know about for finding new jobs?

1. yes
2. no

60. What are these other places for finding new jobs? _____

(SKIP TO # [illegible]. TO CONTINUE)

(NOT EMPLOYED SECTION)

61. Who was your previous employer?_____

62. What kind of business or industry was this employer involved in? (I mean what do they make or do there?) _____

1. agriculture, forestry, fishing
2. mining
3. construction
4. manufacturing
5. transportation, communications, utilities
6. wholesale trade
7. retail trade
8. finance, insurance, real estate
9. services
10. government/public utilities

63. What kind of work did you do there?_____

(CODE AS IN QUESTION 21--ASK FOR CLARIFICATION IF NOT SURE)

64. How many hours did you work normally?_____per week/month (CIRCLE)

65. What was your rate of pay?_____per hour/day/week/biweekly (CIRCLE)

66. Did you belong to a union?

1. yes
2. no

67. How long have you been registered with the Job Service?_____

68. When you first registered with Job Service, were you willing to

	YES	NO
1. relocate your home	____	____
2. enter a training program	____	____
3. work part-time	____	____
4. join a job find club	____	____
5. take a different type of job	____	____
6. take on-the-job training	____	____
7. take a cut in pay	____	____
8. take any available job	____	____

69. Since you are still unemployed at this time, are you <u>now</u> willing to

	YES	NO	NOT SURE	NOT APPLICABI
1. relocate your home	____	____	____	____
2. enter a training program	____	____	____	____
3. work part-time	____	____	____	____
4. join a job find club	____	____	____	____
5. take a different type of job	____	____	____	____
6. take on-the-job training	____	____	____	____
7. take a cut in pay	____	____	____	____
8. take any available job	____	____	____	____

70. Even though you have not found work, will you continue to use the Job Service to help you locate a job?

1. yes
2. no

71. Are there other sources you know of to help find jobs?

1. yes
2. no

72. Are these sources more effective than the Job Service? Why or why not?

    1. yes _____

    2. no _____

73. Many times individuals have difficulty locating a job when they become unemployed. I am going to read you a list of possible reasons why you might have had problems locating a job. Tell me which of these (and it can be more than one) you felt created barriers to your becoming reemployed.

    1. transportation difficulties
    2. lack of training
    3. lack of education
    4. too much experience and time on the job
    5. former wages too high for new job
    6. expected to be called back from layoff
    7. lacked knowledge of skills needed for new job
    8. lacked knowledge of how to go about finding a new job--resume writing, interview techniques, etc.
    9. age
    10. sex
    11. race
    12. appearance
    13. the economy
    14. politics (office politics, union politics, etc.)
    15. none of these
    16. other (specify)

74. What have you liked about using the Job Service? (OPEN ENDED RESPONSE)

75. What have you disliked about using the Job Service?(OPEN ENDED RESPONSE)

_____

_____

I HAVE JUST A FEW MORE QUESTIONS I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU. THESE QUESTIONS WILL HELP US TO USE YOUR ANSWERS MOST EFFECTIVELY IN DECIDING WHAT THE JOB SERVICE IS ALL ABOUT.

76. In what year were you born?_____

77. Are you currently:

1. Married
2. Widowed
3. Divorced
4. Separated
5. Never Married

78. Is your marital status different from what it was when you first became employed?

1. yes
2. no

79. How many persons altogether live in your house, related to you or not?_____
Be sure to include any persons who usually live here, but are away temporarily. Do not include college students away at college, persons stationed away in the Armed Forces, or in institutions. Do include yourself.

80. Are you a veteran?

1. yes (IF YES: ASK KOREAN WAR? OR VIETNAM ERA?)_____
2. no

81. What was the highest grade in school that you finished?

    1. 0-8th grade
    2. 9-11th grade
    3. High School graduate
    4. 1-3 years of college
    5. College graduate or more

82. Do you own your own home:

    1. yes (IF YES: CONTINUE)
    2. no (IF NO: SKIP TO # 85)

83. How long have you lived in this home?_____

84. What is your monthly mortgage payment?_____

    (SKIP TO # 89)

85. Are you currently renting

    1. an apartment?
    2. a house?

86. Do you live with

    1. another family?
    2. another member of your immediate family?
    3. some other family member (e.g. aunt, cousin)? Who?_____
    4. a friend or friends?
    5. your immediate family (spouse and children)

87. How long have you been renting?_____

88. Did you have a house which you had to sell when you became unemployed?

    1. yes
    2. no

89. I am going to read you a list of programs which often help people who need assistance of various kinds. Please tell me whether you have used any of these during the past year?

	YES	NO
1. food from a food bank	_____	_____
2. food stamps	_____	_____
3. fuel assistance	_____	_____
4. emergency shelter	_____	_____
5. Medicaid	_____	_____
6. Welfare	_____	_____
7. Aid to Families with Dependent Children	_____	_____
8. unemployment insurance benefits (checks)	_____	_____
9. other (specify	_____	_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN OUR STUDY. THE ANSWERS YOU HAVE GIVEN WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL AND WILL BE USED IN RESEARCH ONLY. AGAIN, THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE.

*****ASK ONLY IF ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS IS YES******

YOU MENTIONED EARLIER THAT YOU HAD PARTICIPATED IN A TRAINING PROGRAM.

90. What was the name of the training program that you took?_____

91. Where was the program located?_____

(IF GET A DON'T KNOW RESPONSE USE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING PROMPTS)

e.g. special school, on the job training program, community college program

92. What job did the program train you for? In other words, what program were you enrolled in?_____

93. Were you paid during training?

1. yes (IF YES: HOW MUCH?_____/week)
2. no

94. Were you continuing to receive unemployment benefits while you were in training?

1. yes (IF YES: DID THESE BENEFITS INCLUDE EXTENDED BENEFITS OR FEDERAL SUPPLEMENTARY FUNDS?_____)
2. no

95. How long were you unemployed before you began a training program?

1. 1-2 weeks
2. 3-4 weeks
3. 5-6 weeks
4. 6-8 weeks
5. 2-3 months
6. 4-6 months
7. over 6 months

96. After you were accepted for training, did you have to wait to begin the program?

1. yes (IF YES: HOW LONG_____)
2. no

97. Had you heard about the training program from any other source than the Job Service?

1. yes (IF YES: CONTINUE)
2. no (IF NO: RETURN TO OUESTIONNAIRE)

98. Was that source

1. a friend
2. an employer
3. another family member
4. knew of it
5. a co-worker
6. don't remember
7. not applicable

Appendix D

Supplemental Data Tables

Table A

Frequency Distribution of Primary Company Type

Company Type	N	%
Manufacturing	23	12.6
Wholesale-Retail	42	23.1
Construction	15	8.2
Services	53	29.1
Government	16	8.8
Other	33	18.1

(missing = 4)

Table B

Frequency Distribution of Approximate Workforce Size

Category	N	%
Small, less than 50	108	59.3
Moderate, 50 to 500	46	25.3
Large, over 500	28	15.4

Table C

Distribution of Type of Industry as Determined By the Size of the Workforce

TYPE	SIZE Small	Moderate	Large
Manufacturing	10	8	5
Wholesale-Retail	31	8	3
Construction	6	6	3
Services	33	11	8
Government	7	5	4
All Others	19	8	5

Table D

Distribution of Response to Question of Company Involvement in Job Training Under JTPA Programs By Primary Industry Type

TYPE	YES	NO	NEVER HEARD	DON'T KNOW
Manufacturing	5	12	3	3
Wholesale-Retail	6	21	6	5
Construction	0	7	3	2
Services	4	30	8	7
Government	2	7	1	2
All Others	2	17	5	4

N = 165

Table E

Distribution of Response to Question of Company Membership in the PIC as Determined by Use of Job Service*

USED JS	YES	NO	NEVER HEARD	DON'T KNOW
YES	12	26	17	9
NO	3	43	31	12
DON'T KNOW	1	2	1	4

*p<.01

Table F

Distribution of Response to Question of Company Involvement in Job Training Under JTPA Programs as Determined by Use of Job Service*

USED JS	YES	NO	NEVER HEARD	DON'T KNOW
YES	17	12	9	9
NO	6	64	16	10
DON'T KNOW	0	3	1	4

*p<.01

Table G

Distribution of Response to Question of Company Membership in a JSEC Committee as Determined by Use of the Job Service*

USED JS	YES	NO	NEVER HEARD	DON'T KNOW
YES	13	18	22	11
NO	2	37	39	12
DON'T KNOW	0	2	2	4

* p<.001

Table H

Distribution of Response to Questiion of Separation of Job Service Offices from UI Offices as Determined by Use of the Job Service*

USED JS	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
YES	17	14	32
NO	17	7	60

* p<.001

Table I

Distribution of Response to Question About Change in Number of Employees Anticipated Next Year as Determined by Primary Industry Type

TYPE	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
Manufacturing	5	14	4
Wholesale-Retail	9	26	7
Construction	5	7	2
Services	8	34	11
Government	4	11	1
All Others	7	23	3

Table J
Distribution of Response to Question About Use of the Job Service as Determined by Primary Industry Type

TYPE	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
Manufacturing	14	8	1
Wholesale-Retail	12	30	0
Construction	5	8	2
Services	18	34	1
Government	3	11	2
All Others	12	19	2

Table K

Distribution of Response to Effectiveness Rating of the Job Service as Determined by the Approximate Size of the Workforce*

	RATING				
SIZE	VERY EFFECTIVE	EFFECTIVE	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	DON'T KNOW
Small, less than 50	1	9	15	4	57
Moderate, 50 to 500	1	9	12	1	17
Large, over 500	2	9	5	4	5

* p<.001

Table L

Distribution of Response to Effectiveness Rating of the Job Service as Determined by Use of Job Service by Employers*

	RATING				
USED JS	VERY EFFECTIVE	EFFECTIVE	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	DON'T KNOW
YES	4	19	22	7	13
NO	0	7	11	1	62
DON'T KNOW	0	1	0	1	6

*p<.001